

DUMBARTON OAKS

The Byzantine Legacy and Ottoman Forms

Author(s): Speros Vryonis, Jr.

Source: *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 1969/1970, Vol. 23/24 (1969/1970), pp. 251-308

Published by: Dumbarton Oaks, Trustees for Harvard University

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.com/stable/1291294>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



Dumbarton Oaks, Trustees for Harvard University is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*

JSTOR

THE BYZANTINE LEGACY AND OTTOMAN FORMS

SPEROS VRYONIS, JR.

This paper was read at a Symposium entitled "After the Fall of Constantinople," held at Dumbarton Oaks in May 1968.

Note: In translating Turkish, Arabic, and Persian words I have followed a modified version of the system used in the new edition of the *Encyclopaedia of Islam*.
S.V., Jr.

PART ONE

FROM the early Christian era until the eighteenth century, when the Ottoman Empire began to disintegrate as a result of external blows and internal separatism, the inhabitants of extensive regions in the Balkans and Asia Minor experienced the political domination of two "world empires." The polyglot multinational Byzantine and Ottoman empires, which for the greater part of this long time span exercised their control and influence, directly or indirectly, from the imperial city of Constantine and Mehmed, added to the rich historical experience and cultural strata of these areas. There were epochs when the local peoples lived in independence or vassalage, but the Volksgeschichte of even these independent periods shows a definite relationship and often subservience to the Reichsgeschichte, wherein the socio-cultural forms of the empire often asserted themselves within the independent or vassal states. The goal of this paper is to examine the impact which the institutions of Byzantium and the Turks had on one another and to assess elements of continuity and change. When Nicolae Iorga wrote his suggestive monograph, *Byzance après Byzance*, he conceived of the problem as limited largely to the Balkans and to the sphere of Hochkultur. I should like to broaden the present consideration to include Anatolia and to encompass, at least *en passant*, the lower social classes which after all constituted the majority in Byzantine and Ottoman societies.

The struggle of the Byzantines and the Ottomans was the last phase in a long series of Byzantino-Islamic confrontations which first reduced and then extinguished the Christian empire of the East. This threefold process of political retreat, stabilization, and collapse corresponds on the Islamic side to three epochs: the Umayyad, Abbasid, and Turkish. There is a further coincidence between these politico-military-dynastic phases of the Christian-Muslim relationship and the influence which Byzantium exercised on her Muslim sister. During the Umayyad period the Arab caliphate and its institutional life were markedly affected by the Byzantine traditions of Syria, Palestine, Egypt, and North Africa in the administrative, fiscal, legal, military, architectural, artisan, artistic, agricultural, and maritime spheres.¹ By the time the Abbasids removed the Islamic capital to Iraq not only had the forces of Arabism and religious Islam begun to integrate disparate elements into a new

¹ C. Becker, *Islamstudien. Vom Werden und Wesen der islamischen Welt* (Leipzig, 1924) (hereafter *Islamstudien*), I, 1-39; *idem*, "Egypt," *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 1; H. A. R. Gibb, "Arab-Byzantine Relations under the Umayyad Caliphate," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 12 (1958), 223-233; H. I. Bell, "The Administration of Egypt under the Umayyad Khalifs," *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, 28 (1928), 278-286; A. Grohmann, "Griechische und lateinische Verwaltungstermini im arabischen Aegypten," *Chronique d'Egypte*, Nos. 13-14 (1932), 275-284; S. Fraenkel, *Die aramaischen Fremdwörter im klassischen Arabisch* (Göttingen, 1919); I. Goldziher - J. Schacht, "Fikh," *EI*, R. Ettinghausen, *Arab Painting* (London, 1962); G. von Grunebaum, "Die islamische Stadt," *Saeculum*, 6 (1955), 138-139; K. Creswell, "Architecture," *EI*.

civilization, but the new Persian milieu of Iraq and Iran had replaced the Byzantine atmosphere of Syria. Henceforth Iranian influence played a very important role in the evolution of Islamic administration, art, court practices, statecraft, and literature.² It is all the more remarkable that at this time of vanishing Byzantine influence in the domain of statecraft the Greek Bildungsgut made a powerful impact on and helped to create Islamic philosophy, theology, science, and medicine, as well as manuscript illumination.³ Conversely, Islam had an effect on the populations of the former Byzantine provinces largely as a result of Islamization and Arabicization, while within Byzantium proper Islamic influence of the Abbasid era has been traced in court ceremonial, architecture, and miniature painting, and in the realm of literature through the translation of oriental texts into Greek.⁴ It is the third phase of this Byzantine-Muslim relation that we must investigate here. In the broader Mediterranean context this third period, the period of the Seljuk-Ottoman advance from Manzikert to Central Europe, is balanced in the West by the Muslim retreat before the Christian *reconquista* in Spain. These almost contemporary reversals of fortune in the Muslim-Christian war at the two extreme ends of the Mediterranean world resulted in parallel sociological, cultural, and religious phenomena which provide ideal cases for comparative historical studies.

The comparison of Byzantine and Ottoman institutions is a game which many Byzantinists and not a few Ottomanists have played, yet it is one still fraught with snares and obstacles.⁵ The most obvious of these impediments

² G. Wiet, "L'Empire néo-byzantin des Omeyyades et l'Empire néo-sassanide des Abbassides," *Cahiers d'histoire mondiale*, I (1953–54), 63–71; M. Watt, *Islam and the Integration of Society* (London, 1961).

³ G. von Grunebaum, "Parallelism, Convergence, and Influence in the Relations of Arab and Byzantine Philosophy, Literature, and Piety," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 18 (1964), 89–111; *idem*, "Islam and Hellenism," in *Islam. Essays in the Nature and Growth of a Cultural Tradition* (Menasha, 1955), 159–167; M. Meyerhoff, *Von Alexandrien nach Bagdad. Sitzungsberichte der preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, Philos.-hist. Klasse (1930); M. Steinschneider, *Die arabischen Übersetzungen aus dem Griechischen* (Graz, 1960); G. Bergsträsser, *Hunain ibn Ishāq und seine Schule* (Leiden, 1913); F. Rosenthal, *Das Fortleben der Antike im Islam* (Zurich, 1965); M. Watt, *Islamic Philosophy and Theology* (Edinburgh, 1962), 44–89, 93–142.

⁴ C. Becker, "Egypt," *EI*; R. Brunschwig, "Tunis," *EI*; H. Leclercq, *L'Afrique chrétienne* (Paris, 1904), II; C. J. Speel, "The Disappearance of Christianity from North Africa in the Wake of the Rise of Islam," *Church History*, XXIX (1960), 379–397; W. Marçais, "Comment l'Afrique du Nord a été arabisée," *Annales de l'Institut d'études orientales* (Faculté des lettres de l'Université d'Alger), IV (1938), 1–21; A. N. Poliak, "L'arabisation de l'Orient sémitique," *Revue des études islamiques* (1938), 35–63; M. Canard, "Byzantium and the Muslim World to the Middle of the Eleventh Century," *The Cambridge Medieval History*, IV, 1 (1966), 734–735; *idem*, "Le cérémonial fatimite et le cérémonial byzantin. Essai de comparaison," *Byzantion*, XXI (1951), 355–420; A. Grabar, "Le succès des arts orientaux à la cour byzantine sous les Macédoniens," *Münchener Jahrbuch der bildenden Kunst*, III, 2 (1951), 32–50; F. Dölger, "Byzantine Literature," *CMH*, IV, 2 (1967), 242–243.

⁵ The most detailed and comprehensive study of Byzantine and Ottoman institutions is that of M. Köprülü, "Bizans müesseselerini osmanlı müesseselerini tesiri hakkında bâzi mülahazalar," *Türk hukuk ve iktisat tarihi mecmuası*, 1 (1931) (hereafter "Bizans"), 165–313; *idem*, *Alcune osservazioni intorno all'influenza delle istituzioni bizantine sulle istituzioni ottomane* (Rome, 1953); *idem*, "Les institutions byzantines ont-elles joué un rôle dans la formation des institutions ottomanes?" *Bulletin of the International Committee of Historical Sciences*, VI (1933), fasc. 23, 297–302. Köprülü effectively demonstrated the Islamic origin of many Ottoman institutions, but not of all. For different views, see the following: E. Taeschner, "Eine neue türkische Publikation zur Wirtschaftsgeschichte," *Orientalische Literaturzeitung*, XXXVI (1933), 482–490; Ph. Koukoules, *Βυζαντινῶν βίος καὶ πολιτισμός* (Athens, 1948–52), I–VI; *idem*, *Βυζαντινὰ καὶ οὐχὶ τουρκικά ζῆται*, *BZ*, 30 (1929–30), 192–196; B. Cvet-

is the insufficiently investigated nature of the Palaeologan era, of the entire Anatolian experience of the Turks (both Seljuk and beylik), and of the Ottoman rise down to the invasion of Syria and Egypt. Though the similarities of both states are immediately obvious, any attempt to explain them must take into account three possible, but different, origins of these likenesses. First, the Byzantine and Ottoman were polyglot, multisectarian states whose core lay in Anatolia and the Balkans. Accordingly, their emperors and sultans faced many of the same political, social, and economic problems and cultural phenomena. These problems, common to both empires, would have been reflected in their institutional and administrative apparatus; hence, some of these institutions might, theoretically, have been inspired independently of any direct institutional influence or inheritance. Second, the Balkans, Asia Minor, the Levant, and Egypt had, since the conquests of Alexander, formed a common cultural area which, though it possessed strong local cultural variety, had nevertheless many common characteristics. The political, social, and religious structure which the Arabs erected in the former Byzantine and Sassanid provinces resembled those of the Byzantines and Sassanids in many respects. Thus, when the Turks passed into the Muslim lands and were Islamized, they too were influenced by many of the institutions and practices which Islam had absorbed from Byzantium. When the Turks conquered the Byzantine Empire they brought with them many of these institutions, and they were frequently similar to those they then encountered. The third possibility is that the Turks borrowed outright certain customs from the Orthodox and Armenian Christians in Anatolia and the Balkans. Theoretically, the process by which the Turks might have adopted, or unconsciously imitated, Byzantine practices and institutions is a threefold one. It could have come about by direct adoption from the subject populations of the various Turkish states; or indirectly by incorporation of older Islamic practices which were themselves appropriated from Byzantium when the Arabs conquered Syria and Egypt; or because the Turks found similar problems in ruling the Balkans and Anatolia and therefore had to use solutions similar to those of the Byzantines.

A brief survey of the geographical diffusion and strength of Byzantine civilization in the Balkans and Anatolia, as well as of the features of Turkish society on the eve of the invasions of these areas is necessary for a better understanding of this general problem. A similarly important task is to ascertain the quality of the Turkish conquests and the quantity of the Turkish settlers as determinants in the new Balkan-Anatolian synthesis. One may conveniently describe the geographical configuration of Byzantine civilization and influence as composed of three geographical areas, the intensity of whose Byzantine quality usually decreased as one moved from the center to the

kova, "Influence exercée par certains institutions de Byzance et des pays balkaniques du Moyen Age sur le système féodal ottoman," *Byzantino-Bulgarica* (hereafter "Influence"), I (1962), 237–257; G. Arnakis, Οι πρῶτοι Οθωμανοί (Athens, 1947), 101–107; A. S. Tveritinova, "Falsifikatsiya istorii srednevekovoi Turtsei v kemalistskoi istoriografii," *Vizantiiskii Vremennik*, VII (1953), 9–31.

peripheries. The core consisted of Asia Minor west of a line running through Trebizond–Caesarea–western Taurus, the isles, portions of Thrace, Macedonia, and the remainder of the Greek peninsula. Though the area included important heretical groups and various ethnic blocs, it was here that the Greek speaking and Orthodox element was most numerous. The second region or area of partial Byzantinization (the semi-Byzantinized zone) included that portion of Byzantine eastern Asia Minor which the Georgians, Armenians, Syrians, and a minority of Greeks inhabited, and the Balkan regions of Serbia, Bulgaria, and southern Albania. Finally, there was the cultural border region where Byzantine influence largely disappeared; in the East this included the regions of easternmost Armenia, the domains of the Kurds, of the Daylamites in Azerbaijan, of the Arabs in Syria—in the West it was the Slavic regions of Croatia and Bosnia, northern Albania, and the Magyar trans-Danubian regions. Here other influences were dominant and those of Byzantium largely absent.

Thus, as one moves from the geographical core through the semi-Byzantinized zone to the border, or as one leaves the plains, river valleys, and communication arteries for the mountains and marshy regions of isolation, the force and elements of Byzantine civilization diminish. Obviously, if Byzantium did actually exercise an influence on Turkish forms, one would expect to find evidence of it in the areas of the Byzantine core and semi-Byzantinized zone, and of these two the cultural-social structure of the latter was the more complex inasmuch as it represented a series of local syntheses of Byzantine and indigenous forms in varying proportions. These proportions varied in relation to the political and religious policies pursued by the political authorities as well as in relation to other factors (i.e., the folk culture of the various ethnic groups, the proximity and power of other cultural spheres such as that of the Latin church, German influence in Central Europe, or the culture of the caliphate). In the semi-Byzantinized zone of eastern Asia Minor the Syrians and Armenians, prior to their political absorption into the Empire during the tenth and eleventh centuries, had lived under non-Byzantine political authorities (Muslim, Armenian). Obviously, under such circumstances the state was not an instrument of Byzantine culture. Beyond this, ecclesiastical alienation which followed the bifurcation within eastern Christianity after the Council of Chalcedon removed the Armenian and Syrian churches as possible vehicles of further and renewed Byzantine influence. It is significant for the vitality of the indigenous character of Armenian culture that it possessed a highly developed aristocratic class (heavily influenced in antiquity by Persia) which survived without suffering any *caesura brutale* for many centuries. Nevertheless, there were factors which contributed to a local synthesis in the semi-Byzantinized zone occupied by Syrians and Armenians. Both were participants in the cultural koine of the eastern Mediterranean world prior to the disengagement and mutual estrangement of its constituent parts which followed the Monophysite crises and Arab invasions. Within each community there was a small but important segment which nevertheless embraced ecclesiastical

Byzantium . . . the Tzats and Melkites. At the time of the Byzantine *reconquista* of the Macedonian dynasty Armenians and Syrians were recolonized in Byzantine core lands, with what unhappy results we all know. In spite of the Monophysite truculence before ecclesiastical union, Byzantine influence once more became a strong current in the life of these communities, and it is interesting that the Greek classics, too, were not completely unknown. The Armenian Gregory Magistros turned to translating Plato in the eleventh century, whereas the study and translation of Greek texts had never ceased among the Syriac Christians. Though alienated from Byzantine religious life in the fifth century, the Syrian Monophysites, and the Nestorians as well, continued their study of the classical Greek texts and became the principal purveyors of the Byzantine version of Greek culture to the Arabs and the Islamic world. Elements of Byzantine law, art, and literature played a role in the local synthesis of Armenians and Syrians in this semi-Byzantinized zone. By comparison, the Georgians, however, were more directly exposed to Byzantine influence in the realm of formal culture, inasmuch as they fell in the Byzantine ecclesiastical camp and because their formal cultural life had not undergone the same vigorous development before its contact with Byzantium.⁶

In the Balkans it was the Serbs and Bulgars who formed the semi-Byzantinized zone by their creation of the South Slav-Byzantine culture. Though philologists assure us that their invasions and settlements did not constitute a complete and absolute breach with the pre-Slavic traditions of the Balkans, it was only after sufficient passage of time and frequent relations with Byzantium that first the Bulgars and then the Serbs embraced the Byzantine politico-religious institution which placed the Byzantine stamp on their culture in a sharper and more definite manner than had been the case with either Syrians or Armenians. The reasons lay in the less developed character of much of early Serbian and Bulgarian societies and particularly in the absence of any local obstacle to the adoption of Byzantine Christianity. Consequently the decisiveness of the Byzantine influence for the Hochkultur of Bulgaria and Serbia is everywhere manifest; in the state and administration, religion, literature, art and architecture, law, urban and economic life.⁷ However, many of these

⁶ Vryonis, "Problems in the History of Byzantine Anatolia," *Ankara Üniversitesi dil tarih ve coğrafya fakültesi tarih araştırmaları dergisi*, 1 (1963) (hereafter "Problems,"), 113-132; *idem*, "Byzantium: The Social Basis of Decline in the Eleventh Century," *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies*, 2, no. 2 (1959), 157-175; E. Honigmann, *Die Ostgrenze des byzantinischen Reiches von 363 bis 1071 nach griechischen, arabischen, syrischen und armenischen Quellen* (Brussels, 1935); R. W. Thomson, "The Influence of their Environment on the Armenians in Exile in the Eleventh Century," *Supplementary Papers of the Thirteenth International Congress of Byzantine Studies* (Oxford, 1966), 138-140. The chronicles of Michael the Syrian and Bar Hebraeus illustrate the continuing knowledge and study of Greek and the Greek texts, and the Syrian Law Book, E. Sachau, *Syrische Rechtsbücher* (Berlin, 1907), I, vii-xix, reflects the earlier influence of Byzantine law. The most receptive of the Armenians to Byzantine culture were the Tzats, or Chalcedonian Armenians, N. Marr, "Arkaun, mongolskoe nazvanie Khristian, v sviazi s voprosom ob Armianakh-Khalkedonitakh," *VizVrem*, XII (1906), 1-68.

⁷ V. Beševliev, "Zur Kontinuität der antiken Städte in Bulgarien," *Neue Beiträge zur Geschichte der alten Welt*, II (1965), 211-221; M. Gavazzi, "Die Kulturgeographische Gliederung Südosteuropas," *Südost-Forschungen*, XV (1956), 5-21; J. Cvijić, *La péninsule balkanique. Géographie humaine* (Paris, 1918), 13-111. For the Byzantine element in Balkan culture, the best synthesis is that of F. Dölger,

Byzantine influences (especially political and literary) affected only a small proportion of the inhabitants (the upper classes, court circles, urbanites, inhabitants of the major routes of communication) and large masses remained untouched by Byzantine high culture, especially in the mountains and the western Balkans where the old patriarchal *humanitas heroica* prevailed. The vigor of customary law, the *zadruža* polity, and folk poetry are all indices of this vibrance.⁸ On the other hand, the Byzantine cultural substance was not exclusively aristocratic, for the monastic, hagiolytic, iconodulic, and canonic aspects of its Christianity penetrated the society thoroughly. Because of this a real Byzantino-Slav synthesis developed on both the formal and folk levels.

One might misconstrue the preceding remarks to conclude that in the formation of this broad Byzantine cultural sphere in Asia Minor and the Balkans the only common denominator was that which issued from the central core of the Empire to the semi-Byzantinized zones. This would be a manifestly false assumption in many particulars. The Armenians by their wholesale entrance into the Empire's military aristocracy made a great contribution to the Empire and probably lent a certain coloration to this class. Armenian and Syrian merchants and craftsmen were similarly important, and Syrian physicians and translators affected the practice of medicine as well as the cultural life of Byzantines and Slavs by their translations of oriental literature into Greek. The Slavs contributed to the ethnic configuration of Greece, in lesser degree to the Empire's military forces, and to customary law.⁹ These same peoples

"Die mittelalterliche Kultur auf dem Balkan als byzantinisches Erbe," *Byzanz und die europäische Staatenwelt* (Ettal, 1953), 261–81; *idem*, "Byzanz und Südosteuropa," 57–67, and "Der byzantinische Anteil an der Kultur des Balkans," 138–152, in *Völker und Kulturen Südosteuropa*, Schriften der Südosteuropa-Gesellschaft, 1 (Munich, 1959). The Byzantino-Slavic synthesis is treated by I. Dujčev, "L'héritage byzantin chez les Slaves," *Etudes historiques*, II (1965), 131–148; *idem*, "Les Slaves et Byzance," *ibid.*, I (1960), 31–77. Useful orientations to the vast literature on the beginnings of the synthesis are G. Soulis, "The Legacy of Cyril and Methodius to the Southern Slavs," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 19 (1965), 19–43, and R. Jakobson, "The Byzantine Mission to the Slavs. Report on the Dumbarton Oaks Symposium of 1964, and Concluding Remarks about Crucial Problems of Cyrillo-Methodian Studies," *ibid.*, 257–265. The Bulgars were Byzantinized earlier and more extensively, whereas the Serbian version of Byzantine culture was characterized by a greater admixture of Serbian and other non-Byzantine elements: A. Schmaus, "Zur Frage der Kulturorientierung der Serben im Mittelalter," *Südost-Forschungen*, XV (1956), 179–201; J. Matl, *Südslawische Studien* (Munich, 1965), 1–57; C. Jireček, *Staat und Gesellschaft im mittelalterlichen Serbien. Studien zur Kulturgeschichte des 13.–15. Jahrhunderts*. Denkschriften der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien. Philos.-Hist. Klasse, Band LVI, Abh. II–III (1913); Band LVII, Abh. II (1914); G. Ostrogorsky, "Problèmes des relations byzantino-serbes au XIV^e siècle," *Main Papers*, II, *Thirteenth International Congress of Byzantine Studies* (Oxford, 1966), and the comments of Soulis, *Supplementary Papers* (Oxford, 1966), 11–15. Of special significance in the diffusion of Byzantine culture among the Balkan Slavs was Mt. Athos; Dujčev, "Le Mont Athos et les Slaves au Moyen âge," *Medioevo bizantino-slavo* (Rome, 1965), I, 487–510; Soulis, "Tsar Stephan Dušan and Mount Athos," *Harvard Slavic Studies*, II (1954), 125–39; D. Dimitrijević, "L'importance du monachisme serbe et ses origines au monastère athonite de Chilandar," in *Le millénaire du Mont Athos 963–1963, études et mélanges*, 1 (Chevetogne, 1963), 265–77.

⁸ This aspect of Balkan society is forcefully described by Matl, *Die Kultur der Südslawen* (Frankfurt, 1966). G. Gesemann, *Heroische Lebensform* (Berlin, 1943); W. Lettenbauer, "Die Volkskultur der Balkanslaven in ihren Beziehungen zu äusserslavischen Kulturreisen," *Zeitschrift für Balkanologie*, II (1964), 113–25.

⁹ P. Charanis, *The Armenians in the Byzantine Empire* (Lisbon, 1963); N. Adontz, *Etudes arméno-byzantines* (Lisbon, 1965); P. Peeters, *Orient et Byzance. Le tréfonds oriental de l'hagiographie byzantine* (Brussels, 1950); M. Vasmer, *Die Slaven in Griechenland*. Abhandlungen der preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philos.-hist. Klasse, No. 12 (1941).

of the semi-Byzantinized zones served as important vehicles of diffusion of Byzantine culture to nations beyond. The Syrians introduced the Arabs to Byzantine urban-administrative as well as to intellectual life, and the South Slavs played an important role in bringing aspects of the Byzantine heritage to the Rumanians and Russians.¹⁰ Consequently, the cultural vitality and creativity of these peoples within Byzantine civilization were real and substantial. Simultaneously one should say that the Byzantine forms emanating from the central core were the dominant and characteristic features of this civilization. It is important to note that this Byzantine influence proved itself to be powerful even in periods of political weakness. This is particularly evident in the intensified Byzantinization of Serbian formal life in the reign of Stephan Dushan just at that time when the political might of Byzantium was collapsing in the central and southern Balkans. When the Turks first invaded Asia Minor and the Balkans they found societies which were in process of political and military disintegration, but which nevertheless constituted compact social and cultural entities.

The social forms and cultural affiliations of the Turks prior to their Anatolian incursions were quite different from those just described. The Seljuk Turks encountered the religion of Islam in the tenth century and its civilization and political life in the eleventh. From this encounter there arose the Turkish sultanate, a transformation of the tribal Asiatic khanate by Islamic political theory in which the political authority usurped by the Turkish rulers was rationalized. Henceforth the Turkish rulers, as sultans, assumed the role of Muslim potentates, for which role their Persian viziers and administrators prepared and schooled them.

At this highest level of formal Turkish society, the newcomers entered and participated in traditional Islamic sedentary society, and the same pattern was characteristic of all the tribal chieftains who abandoned the errant life to become rulers of non-nomadic states. They and their immediate followers thus abandoned their former polity, were gradually sedentarized, and wherever they went, as in thirteenth-century Anatolia, the sultans created an Islamic court and culture about them by encouraging the immigration of the representatives of this culture to the new domains. In the eleventh century, however, this metamorphosis from nomad to sedentary seems to have been a relatively limited phenomenon among the Seljuks, and the majority of the followers of the Seljuks remained in their tribal state.¹¹ Their nomadic status was

¹⁰ See notes nos. 1 and 3, *supra*. P. Olteanu, "Origines de la culture slave dans la Transylvanie du Nord et le Maramureş," *Romanoslavica*, 1 (1958), 169–97; E. Turdeanu, *Les principautés roumaines et les Slaves du sud: Rapports littéraires et religieux* (Munich, 1959); *idem*, *La littérature bulgare du XIV^e siècle et sa diffusion dans les pays roumains* (Paris, 1947); G. Nandriş, "The Beginnings of Slavonic Culture in the Rumanian Countries," *The Slavonic and East European Review*, XXIV (1946), 160–71; M. Murko, *Geschichte der älteren südslawischen Literaturen* (Leipzig, 1908), 108, 162, 194–95.

¹¹ The best account of this society under the Great Seljuks is O. Turan, *Selçuklular tarihi ve Türk-Islami medeniyeti* (Ankara, 1965) (hereafter *Selçuklular*). The nature of Oghuz society in the tenth and eleventh centuries emerges from two contemporary accounts: C. Brockelmann, "Mahmud al-Kashgari über die Sprache und die Stämme der Turken im 11. Jahrhundert," *Körösi Csoma Archivium*, I (1921–25), 26–40, and A. Z. V. Togān, *Ibn Fadlān's Reisebericht*, Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes, XXIV, 3 (Leipzig, 1939) (hereafter *Ibn Fadlan-Togān*), 19ff. F. Sümer, "Anadolu'ya

above all characterized by its mobile nature. There was no tribal institution—domicile, cuisine, economy, or military weaponry and tactics—which did not conform to the demands of maximum mobility. The steppe environment with its harsh law of survival had forged a society which was sharply differentiated from the societies it was to conquer. Türkmen nomadism brought with it in particular an economic life which was to become the bane of agriculture, an economy relying largely, though not exclusively, upon pastoralism and warfare. For the former the Türkmens sought pasturage which they usually expropriated by warfare at the expense of the farming population. Warfare, especially raiding and banditry, was a highly customary source of enrichment and it made great slave traders of the Türkmens. Their social, military, and economic life was fused in their institutions. Formally Islamized in the tenth century, the effect of the new religion resulted in nothing more than a thin coating over the old tribal shamanism of the Türkmens, the tribal shamans simply becoming Muslim *baba's* while retaining their older characteristics. Among the most spectacular survivals of these previous shaman practices is human sacrifice, a custom which persisted for centuries after the Turks first entered Byzantine lands and which was related to their warrior culture.¹²

yalnız göçebe türkler mi geldi?" *Belleten*, Türk Tarih Kurumu, XXIV, 96 (1960), 567–596, attempted to give greater emphasis to the sedentary quality among the Turks. D. Theodorides, "Turkeitürkisch nadas," *Zeitschrift für Balkanologie*, IV (1966), 146–48, has introduced a significant modification to one of Sümer's points. There is no satisfactory study of Turkish nomadism in Anatolia during the period between the eleventh and fifteenth centuries. The remarks of V. Gordlevsky, *Izbrannye sochineniya* (Moscow, 1960), I, 70–95, are useful but are based on only a partial sampling of the available source material. For the Ottoman period, Sümer, *Oğuzlar (Türkmenler) tarihleri-boy teşkili-destanları* (Ankara, 1967).

¹² M. Köprülü, "Anadoluda İslamiyet," *Edebiyat fakültesi mecması*, II (1928), 385; *idem*, *Türk edebiyatında ilk mutasavvıflar* (Ankara, 1966), 207, 215., for the fusion of Turkish shamanist religion and Islam; also his brief, *Influence de chamanisme turco-mongol* (İstanbul, 1929).

Contemporary observers testify to the survival of human sacrifice among the Turks in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. John Cantacuzene, who knew the Turks as well as did any other Byzantine author and who had used Turkish soldiers in extensive numbers, remarks that the Turkish soldiers performed human sacrifice over the graves of their slain comrades: *Contra Mahometem Aprologia*, PG, 154, col. 545; Τί γάρ τῆς τοιαύτης ὀμότητος καὶ μισανθρωπίας χείρον γένοιτ' ἄν, ὃστε φονεύειν μηδὲν ἡδικήκοτας; καὶ γάρ ὅπόταν ἀπέλθωσι Μουσουλμάνοι πρὸς πόλεμον, καὶ ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ πέσῃ τις ἔξ αὐτῶν, οὐ λογίζονται ἑαυτούς ἀξίους μέμψεως, ὡς αἵτινος τοῦ πολέμου, ἀλλ᾽ ἐπὶ τὸ νεκρὸν σώματα τοῦ πεπιτωκότος σφάττουσι ζῶντας δόσους ἀν δυνηθῆ ἔκαστος, καὶ δόσον πλείους κτείνει, τοσοῦτον ὀφέλειαν λογίζεται τῆς τοῦ τεθνεῶτος ψυχῆς. Εἰ δ' Ἰσως οὐκ αὐτούς εἰς ἔξουσίαν αὐτοῦ ὁ βουλόμενος βοηθήσαι τῇ τοῦ τεθνεῶτος ψυχῇ, ἔξωνεῖται Χριστιανός, εἴπερ εὑροι, καὶ ἡ ἐπάνω τοῦ νεκροῦ σώματος σφάττει αὐτούς, ἢ ἐπὶ τῷ τάφῳ αὐτοῦ. Καὶ ὁ ταῦτα νομοθετῶν πῶς ἀπὸ Θεοῦ;

Murat II purchased six hundred slaves in the Peloponnesus which he then sacrificed to his dead father; Chalcocondyles, 348. μετὰ δὲ δώνησάμενος ἀνδράποδα ἐξακόσια θυσίαν ἀνῆγε τῷ ἑαυτοῦ πατρί, ἔξιλεούμενος τῷ φόνῳ τῶν ἀνδρῶν τούτων.

These two references are very clear and there can be no doubt that human sacrifice survived among a portion of the Türkmen tribes in Anatolia and the Balkans as late as the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. Cantacuzene understood the purpose of these sacrifices, but was in error when he considered the practice to be of Islamic origin. Islam, of course, never tolerated human sacrifice, and what he describes is clearly a central Asiatic shamanistic practice. Among the shamanistic Ural-Altaic peoples it was commonly believed that those whom a warrior slew in this world would serve him in the next. Thus human sacrifice at the grave of the dead warrior was a well-known custom in the religions of the Turco-Mongol peoples and was observed as early as Herodotus and as late as the nineteenth century. Theophanes, ed. de Boor, I, 379, records it among the Khazars, τοῦ δὲ Τουδούνου κατὰ τὴν ὁδὸν τεθνικότος, οἱ Χάλαρεις εἰς δοχὴν αὐτοῦ ἀπέκτειναν τὸν τουρμάρχην σὺν τοῖς τριακοσίοις στρατιώταις. D. Dunlop, *The History of the Jewish Khazars* (Princeton, 1954), 175. For the cult of the dead among the shamanist peoples, see the following, where more detailed reference is made to human sacrifice: *Ibn Fadlan-Toğan* (as in note 11 *supra*), 24–25, 236–37; J.-P. Roux, *La mort chez les peuples*

The Turks brought a hybrid society with them when they moved across the Islamic world and entered Asia Minor: Islamic and nomadic. During the centuries that followed their initial appearance in Anatolia and the Balkans the nature of Turkish society changed radically. In the early stages of the invasions the Turks were predominantly nomads, but they began, gradually, to become settled—a trend which continued until the nineteenth century. In sixteenth-century western Anatolia the proportion of nomad to sedentary Muslim was 16.6 per cent to 83.4 per cent. By the late seventeenth century the sedentarization of nomads seems to have intensified sharply.¹³

In terms of the Byzantine legacy and Ottoman forms the significant factor that should be noted here is that the Türkmens or Yürüks who abandoned the tribal for the settled life in Anatolia and the Balkans were sedentarized in the homeland of Byzantine culture (Slavic-Greek-Armenian). This is parallel to the sedentarization of the Arabs, during the first Islamic centuries, in the former Byzantine provinces of Mesopotamia, Syria, Palestine, Egypt, and North Africa. The importance of the sedentarization of the Arabs in these formerly Byzantine provinces was, of course, momentous in the formation of early Islamic society. One should, however, make this reservation: When the Arabs conquered these Byzantine provinces in the seventh century Islam was not yet a fully developed civilization and culture, it still consisted primarily of the utterances of Muhammad and the simpler society of the inhabitants of the Arabian peninsula. In contrast, the Turkish sultans, by conversion to Islam and official affiliation with the caliphate, inherited at this top level of

altaïques anciens et médiévaux d'après les documents écrits (Paris, 1963); A. Inan, *Tarihte ve bugün şamanizm materyaller ve araştırmalar* (Ankara, 1954), 176–200; M. Eliade, *Le chamanisme et les techniques archaïques de l'extase* (Paris, 1951), 175–88, 189–90.

Schiltberger, *Reisen des Johannes Schiltberger aus München im Europa, Asia, und Afrika von 1394 bis 1427*, ed. K. F. Neumann, with commentaries of J. Fallmereyer and Hammer-Purgstall (Munich, 1859), 130, remarks on a curious practice which may or may not be connected with this sacrifice: "Es ist och ze mercken, das Machmet deu ziten als er off ertrich gewesen ist, viertzig diener gehept hat. Die selben haben ein besondere gesellschaft und einen punt gemacht wider die christenheit. Und das ist ir gesatz: Wer in ir gesellschaft will sin, der muss schweren wa er einen cristen ankäm, das er in nit leben lassen woll nach gefangen niem, weder von gunsts noch von guts wegen. Und wär das daz er by einem vechten, das die heiden mit den cristen tätten nit gesin möcht, so sol er einen cristen koffen und sol in tötten. Und welich in der gesellschaft sint die heissen they und der sint vil in der türckay und ziehent all weg off die cristen, wann es ir gesatz ist."

Bartholomaeus Georgieuz, *The Offspring of the House of Ottomanno and Officers pertaining to the grate Turke*, etc., tr. H. Gouge (London, 1570) (hereafter Bartholomaeus Georgieuz-Gouge), in the chapter entitled, "What is assigned to be done by the Testamentes of the Turkes, as welle of menne as women" reports the following practice "But the women geve monye unto soultyners, for to kill a certaine number of Christians. They make account that by so doyng, it will greatly profite the health of their soules."

All such practices may have given rise to the rumor that the Turks were cannibals; Pachymeres, I, 134: παρά πολλοῖς δ' ἐλέγοντο κυνοκέφαλοι, καὶ γε διαίταις ἀπειρημέναις ἡκούοντο χρώμενοι, ὥστε καὶ ἀνθρωποφαγεῖν ἐπιστένουτο.

For another funeral custom, i.e., mummification, brought by the Turks from central Asia, see O. Turan, "Şemseddin Altun-Aba vakfiyesi ve hayatı," *Belleten, Türk Tarih Kurumu*, XI, 42 (1947), 208–210.

¹³ Ö. Barkan, "Essai sur les données statistiques des registres de recensement dans l'empire ottoman aux XV^e et XVI^e siècles," *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient*, I (1958) (hereafter "Essai"), 30. In the early sixteenth century Anadolu (western Anatolia) had 388, 397 sedentary Muslim hearths and 77,268 nomad hearths (this does not include the asker class). See notes 157–160 *infra*.

Turkish society an entire civilization with highly developed systems of religion, law, literature, art, and economic and urban life. Nevertheless, this was offset by the fact that all the various elements of Islamic civilization had not at this early time (eleventh century) affected the mass of the invading Türkmens, who still lived in the impervious social cocoon of tribalism. Consequently, the majority of the Türkmens continued to live in a condition strongly recalling that of the Arab bedouins when they entered the Levant, Iraq, Egypt, etc.

A second fact to be considered at this point follows: The Turks first entered Asia Minor in the eleventh century and the Balkans (as settlers) only in the second half of the fourteenth. Consequently, three centuries separate the appearance of this conquering people in the two peninsulas. One must, therefore, take into account the dynamics of social-cultural change within both the Turkish and Byzantine spheres during this interval. The Turkish-Muslim society, which effected the initial conquest in Anatolia, underwent a great transformation during its three-century residence in Anatolia so that when it next implanted itself in the Balkans—during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries—it had experienced a substantial evolution. These changes, to which one can only allude here, included widespread sedentarization of nomads, large-scale conversions of Christians and absorption of their style of life in Anatolia, and the influx of a considerable Muslim sedentary element from the traditional Islamic lands. The nomadic element which crossed the straits to Europe remained most free of this change, but it was, in its turn, sedentarized in a Byzantino-Balkan milieu. Concomitant to this evolution within Turkish-Muslim society was the development in Byzantine society. As the Turks conquered Asia Minor, the development of Byzantine society there was arrested in the sense that it was cut off from the heartbeat of the culture, and so took on a more archaic or fossilized aspect with the passage of time. The Christians of Seljuk Anatolia did not share in many of the later Byzantine developments (*pronoia* for instance). Consequently, the Byzantine society which the Turks found in eleventh-century Anatolia differed in some respects from that which they found in fourteenth-century Bithynia and the Balkans.

In past discussions of Byzantine influence on Turkish society and culture there has been a tendency to concentrate on the spectacular conquest of Constantinople and the replacement of the basileus with a sultan. More recently scholars have called attention to the absorption of local Christian elements and forces in the Balkans. However, there is good reason to believe that much of this Byzantinization of the conquerors took place in late eleventh- and twelfth-century Anatolia and in thirteenth- and fourteenth-century Bithynia.

Not less important than the nature of Byzantine and Turkish society, in this discussion of interplay between the institutions of the two societies, is the character of the Turkish conquests and settlements as a conditioning factor which helped to determine the new synthesis in the Balkans and Anatolia. In examining this fundamental problem we must ask and attempt to answer two difficult questions. Were the Turkish invasions of a destructive or pacific

character? How great was the number of Turks who entered Asia Minor and the Balkans? The question of the destructive or relatively pacific character of the Turkish conquests and migrations is one which has roused considerable disagreement. One group of scholars strongly asserts that the Turkish occupation of the two peninsulas was effected by fire and the sword and accompanied by massacre, enslavement, destruction, and barbarization of society.¹⁴ A second school counters, with equal vigor, that the Turkish arrival was relatively peaceful, uneventful, and brought the economic and cultural fruits of political stability and unification to the politically splintered and underdeveloped Anatolian and Balkan populations.¹⁵ Paradoxically, both propositions contain elements of truth as well as, incidentally, the answer to our question. But the paradox disappears upon closer consideration, for, as the heir of steppe nomadism and the Islamic sultanate, eleventh-century Turkish society contained within it both potentials, i.e., destruction and construction. Nomadism brought with it, as we saw, an economy based on pastoralism and raiding. Thus, nomadization meant the violent disruption of sedentary life and therefore not only its economic decline but its partial destruction. The Islamic state, in the conquest of Byzantine lands, harnessed the natural bellicosity of the nomad to its own needs by attaching it to the *jihad* against the Christians. But within its own domains the sultanate toiled to establish all the elements of a viable sedentary culture—agriculture, crafts, commerce, religion, and above all the peace and security which were absolutely essential to this culture. There was latent, in this relation between the sultan and the nomads, a highly destructive tendency which was restrained only when the state was centralized and strong. When it weakened or disappeared the political and military might of the nomads was no longer constrained. Consequently, the periods from the late eleventh to the mid-twelfth century, and from the later thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, periods in which there was no effective control of a centralized state in large areas, were characterized by rampant nomadism and destruction. The list of destroyed towns and villages in these periods is a long one. Conversely, with the stabilization of a centralized authority in the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries and again with the effective establishment of unified and centralized rule of the Ottoman sultans order once more prevailed, society recovered, and life prospered.

How destructive, then, was the Turkish conquest? If it had been as destructive as some maintain, we could terminate our discussion of the Byzantine legacy at this point, for obviously there would have been nothing left of it in the Balkans and Anatolia to discuss. Though it may have been so destructive in certain localities, the overall conquest was characterized by a conservation

¹⁴ The most detailed study of this destructive aspect of the Turkish conquests is D. Angelov's "La conquête des peuples balkaniques par les Turcs," *Byzantinoslavica*, XVII (1956), 220–275; "Turskoto zavoevanie i borbata na balkanskie narodi protiv nashestvantsite," *Istoricheski pregled*, IX (1953), 374–398. A. Vakalopoulos, "Ιστορία τοῦ νέου Ελληνισμοῦ" (Thessaloniki, 1964), II₁, 40–60, 62–98; I. Snegarov, *Turskoto vladichestvo prechka za kulturnoto razvitiie na bulgarskiiia narod i drugite balkanski narodi* (Sofia, 1958), takes a completely negative view of the Ottoman conquest and administration.

¹⁵ Most recently, F. Sümer, "The Turks in Eastern Asia Minor in the Eleventh Century," *Supplementary Papers, Thirteenth International Congress of Byzantine Studies* (Oxford, 1966), 141–143.

of a significant portion of the local societies.¹⁶ We may further refine the answer by comparing the process in the Balkans and Anatolia. The Turkish conquest-settlement in Anatolia was prolonged, repeated in certain areas, and resulted in a phenomenal political splintering from the eleventh century until the final Ottoman reunification in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries. The political stabilization attained by Konya and Nicaea in the thirteenth century is a brilliant but solitary light in this long period. By contrast the Ottomans conquered the major portion of the Balkans in little more than a century after the seizure of Gallipoli, and, had it not been for the nearly fatal Timurid interlude, they would have effected the conquest much sooner. Also, if one takes into account the fact that during the conquest the Balkan kingdoms were first attached to the Ottomans in a vassal status, then the actual period of conquest is even shorter. Though it is true that the conquest itself, during its brief extent, was brutal and destructive, the Ottomans early asserted a strict centralized control and conditions were quickly normalized. Finally, we return to the apparent paradox, that the Turks ultimately brought political unification and stability on the one hand and definite disruption, even destruction, on the other. The sultans, once they had established political and military control, labored indefatigably to restore economic prosperity, tranquility, and security within their domains. But until this was finally accomplished Byzantine society suffered the cruel afflictions of war, especially in Anatolia. The destruction of towns and villages has already been mentioned. A brief sampling will suffice to convey the nature of this aspect of Turkish conquest. Anna Comnena remarks that by the end of the eleventh century a large proportion of the towns along the Aegean coastline from the north to Attalia had been completely or partially destroyed.¹⁷ When the Second Crusaders passed through western Asia Minor, Odo of Deuil remarked that, though the Greeks had rebuilt and recolonized some of the urban centers, many of the towns were still nothing more than uninhabited ruins.¹⁸ Adramyttium, formerly very populous and prosperous, was so destroyed, a contemporary relates, that one could not tell whether it had ever been inhabited by man.¹⁹ Dorylaeum, one of the largest and most prosperous of Greek towns in Asia Minor, lay a deserted ruin for over one hundred years, no one stone standing upon another in the ruins.²⁰ Caesareia remained an uninhabited shambles for over half a

¹⁶ On this conservative aspect, see H. Inalcık, "Ottoman Methods of Conquest," *Studia Islamica*, II (1954) (hereafter "Conquest"), 103–129.

¹⁷ Anna Comnena, *Alexiade*, ed. B. Leib (Paris, 1937) (hereafter Anna Comnena), III, 23; ... ἡ τῶν κατὰ θάλατταν διακειμένων πόλεών τε καὶ χωρῶν λεηλασία καὶ παντελής ἐρείπωσις" III, 142, ...τὸ κατά τὴν παραλίαν τῆς Σμύρνης καὶ μέχρι αὐτῆς Ἀτταλείας οἱ βάρβαροι τελείως ἤριπωσαν.

¹⁸ Ode of Deuil, *De projectione Ludovici VII in orientem*, ed. and tr. V. G. Berry (New York, 1948), 86–89: *Quam cum tota esset iuris, Graecorum hanc ex magna parte Turci possident, illis expulsis, aliam destruxerunt; 106–107: Ibi multas urbes destructas invenimus.*

¹⁹ Anna Comnena (as in note 17 *supra*), III, 143: πόλις δὲ πρώην μὲν ἦν πολυσυνθρωποτάτη· ὀπτηνίκα δὲ ὁ Τίλσχας τὰ κατά τὴν Σμύρνην ἔλήζετο καὶ αὐτὴν παυτελῶς ἐριπώσας ἤφαντε. τὸν γοῦν παυτελῇ ἀφανισμὸν τῆς τοιαύτης θεασάμενος πόλεως, ὡς δοκεῖν μηδὲ ἀνθρωπον κατοικῆσαι ποτε ἐν αὐτῇ.

²⁰ Cinnamus, 294–295: τὸ δὲ Δορύλαιον τοῦτο ἦν μὲν ὅτε πόλις ἦν μεγάλη τε εἴπερ τις τῶν ἐν Ἀσίᾳ καὶ λόγου ἄξια πολλοῦ..... ἀλλὰ Πέρσαι, ὀπτηνίκα ἡ κατά Ῥωμαίων ἡκμαζεν ἐκδρομή, τὴν τε πόλιν εἰς ἔδαφος βεβλημένην ἀνθρώπων ἔρημον παντάπασιν ἐπεποίηντο καὶ τὰ τῇδε πάντα μέχρι καὶ ἐπὶ λεπτὸν τῆς πάλαι σεμνότητος ἤφαντον ἵχνος.

century, not being rebuilt until the mid-twelfth century.²¹ These are merely three cases from a long list of sacked or destroyed Byzantine towns in the first century of the Seljuk-Byzantine conflict. In this early period the sources reveal that over seventy-five towns and villages were subjected, to severe devastation, some of them being sacked on more than one occasion,²² and twenty-seven of these towns were destroyed and became uninhabited for varying periods. In the late thirteenth and fourteenth centuries after the collapse of Konya and Nicaea the *furor nomadicus* once more devastated extensive areas of Anatolia.²³ The sources are far from adequate, yet the list of

²¹ Baldricus, in *Recueil des historiens des croisades, Historiens orientaux*, IV (1898), 39: *venerunt quoque ad Caesaream Cappadociae quae ad solum diruta erat: ruinae tamen utcumque subsistentes quanti fuerit illa Caezarea testabantur.* Bar Hebraeus, *The Chronography of Gregory Abu'l Faraj the Son of Aaron, the Hebrew Physician commonly known as Bar Hebraeus, being the First Part of his Political History of the World*, tr. E. A. W. Budge (London, 1932) (hereafter Bar Hebraeus), I, 258: "Then this Malik Mahammad restored Caesarea of Cappadocia, which had been destroyed for a long time and there he dwelt." Michael the Syrian, *Chronique*, ed. and tr. J. B. Chabot (Paris, 1905) (hereafter Michael the Syrian), III, 237: "Il se mit à restaurer la ville de Cesarée, en Cappadoce, qui était ruinée depuis longtemps."

²² The list which follows is taken from a longer study, in progress, on the Islamization of Asia Minor.

Western Anatolia

Cyzicus	Nymphaeum	Prusa	Laodiceia
Cius	Ephesus	Claudiopolis	Hierapolis
Apollonias	Philadelphieia	Pithecas	Tripolis
Poimamenum	Tralles	Malagina	Tantalus
Lopadium	Louma	Dorylaeum	Caria
Adramyttium	Pentacheir	Cotyaeum	Antioch ad Maeandrum
Calamus	Melanoudium	Amorium	Choma
Meleum	Latrus	Cedrea	
Smyrna	Strobilus	Polybotus	
Clazomenae	Attaleia	Philomelium	
Phocaea	Nicomedeia	Sozopolis	
Sardis	Nicaea	Chonae	

Eastern Anatolia

Caesarea	Gargar
Arabissus	Melitene
Albistan	Bar Mar Sauma
Kaisum	Sebasteia
Edessa	Arzen
Nisibis	Ani

Northern Anatolia

Sinope	Castamon
Trebizond	Doceia
Amisus	Comana
Paipert	Euchaita
Coloneia	Pimolissa
Neocaesarea	Gangra
Amaseia	Dadybra

Southern Anatolia

Seleuceia	Corycus
Mopsuestia	Adana
Pracana	

Central Anatolia

Ankara	Archelais
Iconium	Laodiceia Combusta

²³ The principal sources for this upheaval are Pachymeres and Kerim ed-Din Mahmud of Aksaray.

destroyed towns and villages in western Anatolia which they yield is awesome.²⁴ When the famous Arab traveller Ibn Battuta visited Anatolia in 1333 he commented upon the ravaged state of such towns as Erzerum, Izmir, Ephesus, Pergamum, and Iznik.²⁵

The Turkish invasions were thus highly destructive in Anatolia, less so in the Balkans, and in general were the most disruptive ethnic intrusion which the eastern half of the old Roman Empire experienced.²⁶ The seventh-century Arab invasions had been far less disruptive and destructive and the Slavic invasion, though destructive, did not ultimately disrupt the cultural sway of new Rome in the Balkans. As we shall see, the Turkish invasions did not completely eradicate the Byzantine substratum in either peninsula, but reduced most of Byzantine civilization in this area to a *Volkskultur* by destroying,

²⁴ The economic chaos emerges from the accounts of Hamd-allah Mustawfi Qazwini, a fiscal official of the Ilhanids *ca.* 1335, who relates that the revenues of Rum, Armenia, and Georgia were less than 25 per cent of what they had been in the time of the Seljuks, *The Geographical Part of the Nuzhat-al-Qulub composed by Hamd-allah Mustawfi of Qazwin in 740 (1340)*, tr. G. Le Strange (London, 1919), 94–95, 100. See also W. Hinz, “Steuerinschriften aus dem mittelalterlichen vorderen Orient,” *Bulleten, Türk Tarih Kurumu*, XIII, 52 (1949), 745–769; M. Akdağ, “Osmanlı imparatorluğunun kuruluş ve inkişafı devrinde Türkiye'nin iktisadi vaziyeti,” (resume in French) *ibid.*, 570.

Destroyed or partially destroyed towns and villages:

Western Anatolia

Tralles	Croulla	Nicaea
Priene	Catoicia	Smyrna
Miletus	Cenchrae	Uluburlu
Caria	Belocome	Egridir
Antioch	Angelocome	Pergamum
Melanoudium	Anagourda	Aynegöl
Nyssa	Platanea	Akhisar
Tripolis	Melangeia	Biga
Thyraium	Assus	Kevele
Ephesus	Prusa	
Magnesia		

Eastern Anatolia

Edessa	Aksaray
Erzerum	Sebasteia
Kayseri	Alashkert
Erzinjian	Ani
Albistan	Malatya

Southern Anatolia

Sis	Patara
Mopsuestia	Myra
Tarsus	Laranda
Ayas	Ereğli
Adana	Selefke
Corycus	

Northern Anatolia

Pompeipoulis
Tokat
Camah

²⁵ Ibn Battuta, *The Travels of Ibn Battuta*, tr. H. A. R. Gibb (Cambridge, 1962) (hereafter Ibn Battuta-Gibb), II, 437, 445, 448, 453.

²⁶ See the comments of the following contemporaries: Eustathius of Thessaloniki, PG, 135, col. 944; Theodore Scutariotes, Μεσαιωνική Βιβλιοθήκη ed. K. Sathas (Venice-Paris, 1894) (hereafter Theodore Scutariotes-Sathas), VII, 169; Fulcher of Chartres, R. H. C., H. O., III (1884), 336; Manuel Palaeologus, *Lettres de l'empereur Manuel Paléologue*, ed. E. Legrande (Amsterdam, 1962), 22.

absorbing, or otherwise removing many of the receptacles and carriers of its Hochkultur.

Turning to the second question—the numbers of Turks who entered Anatolia and the Balkans—we must rely upon indirect evidence, inasmuch as the earliest comprehensive demographic information comes from the Ottoman tax registers of the sixteenth century. It would appear that up to the thirteenth century the Christian population of Anatolia was still quite numerous and probably outnumbered the Muslims, but that after that time the migration of new Turkish and Tatar tribes, large waves of conversion, and the enslavement and massacre of Christians began to swing the balance in the other direction. In the Balkans the Turks remained a minority. Since matters of conversion, ethnography, and demography will receive further attention at a later point these remarks will suffice for the present.²⁷

PART Two

Having discussed the complex background of the subject, we must now proceed to the subject itself and first to the nature of the influence which the Byzantine legacy may have had on Turkish forms. The fact which first strikes the observer, that the institutions of the Seljuks and Ottomans on the level of Hochkultur (their tribal institutions apart) are Islamic rather than Byzantine, is a natural consequence of the Turkish historical experience. The eleventh-century Turks, in contrast to the seventh-century Arabs, inherited a completely formed Islamic civilization, whereas the Arabs had to create and develop a new civilization from the substantial cultures of Iran and Byzantium. Thus, the style of Seljuk and Ottoman institutional life—the state, religious structure, literature, and much of the art—was Muslim. There is nothing specifically Byzantine about any of these forms, at least in terms of direct borrowing. Those elements which may relate to Byzantium do so in terms of the remoter past when Arabs took them from seventh-century Byzantium. But these elements had, long ago, been thoroughly integrated so that they were no longer recognizable as something specifically Byzantine. Indeed, the Persian element, which replaced the Byzantine during the Abbasid period, is still pre-eminent among the Seljuk Turks. There is no doubt that in general the Turkish forms are similar to those of Byzantium in the very broadest sense, inasmuch as we are dealing with centralized bureaucratic theocracies. But again, this is the result of a broad affiliation to the imperial traditions of the Near East, from which grew the Byzantine, Sassanid, and Islamic Empires.

There were two basic phenomena, however, which permitted Byzantine influence to filter through the Islamic trappings of Seljuk-Ottoman institutional life. First, the Turks had to apply and adjust the complex Islamic politico-cultural apparatus to a Byzantino-Armenian and Byzantino-Slav milieu. In addition, there was a theoretical device within this Islamic appa-

²⁷ See *infra*, notes 141–150.

ratus by which specific non-Muslim practices could be accommodated. Such a principle had been elaborated early in Islamic history because of pragmatic necessity. In the Turkish period the sultans could legislate (the principle of *urfı*) by way of supplementing Islamic law. This loophole enabled them to move above and beyond the specific provisions of the holy law.²⁸ Partly as a consequence of the application of Islamic institutions to this Byzantine milieu and of the sultan's legislative powers the Seljuk and Ottoman empires differed markedly from such other Islamic states as the Mameluke and Safavi.

It will be convenient here to glance, briefly, at the class structure of the Balkan and Anatolian regions during this long period of conflict between Byzantium and the Turks. At the apex of the social structures the Turkish conquest removed the ruling dynasties of the Armenians, Greeks, Serbs, and Bulgars; only the Rumanian princes survived the initial conquest. At the next gradation of society the aristocracies suffered a partial displacement and diminution. The Armenian nobles fled to the Taurus, Cilicia, Egypt, and to Byzantium in the eleventh century. The Byzantine aristocrats often abandoned their estates in central and eastern Anatolia. Indeed Alexius Comnenus himself witnessed with his own eyes the Turkish raids on the old family holdings (now abandoned) at Castamon, whereas Bourtzes was ordered to raid his former estates now within Turkish territory and to evacuate the villagers so that they would be spared Turkish rule. There is a steady westward flight of Byzantine magnates in the eleventh, twelfth, and fourteenth centuries from Anatolia to the Balkans. Later, many of the members of this class continued the flight before the Turks, seeking refuge in Venetian possessions or in the West. Anna Notaras, daughter of the megadux who had in the heat of theological passion expressed a preference for the Turks, chose to live in Italy rather than in Turkish possessions. There is a corresponding withdrawal northward before the Turkish advance on the part of the Serbian and Bulgarian aristocrats.²⁹

Simultaneous with this dispersion of some of the higher aristocracy before the advancing Turks, however, one sees that a substantial number remained in the Seljuk and Ottoman domains and participated actively in the economic, political, and military life of these Turkish lands. The activity of Armenian nobles in the early Turkish conquests and military administration is clearly evident in the chronicle of Matthew of Edessa. The Turkish epic, the Danishmendname, composed in the thirteenth century to commemorate the initial conquests in northeastern Anatolia, recalls vividly and in great detail the participation of these Armenian lords. The Syrian merchants and landowners remained in eastern Asia Minor, being as fearful of the Greeks and Arme-

²⁸ F. Taeschner, "Eine neue turkische Publikation . . .," *OLZ*, XXXVI (1933), 485–488. Inalcık, "The Problem of the Relationship between Byzantine and Ottoman Taxation," *Akten des XI. Internationalen Byzantinist-Kongresses München 1958* (Munich, 1960) (hereafter "Taxation"), 237–242.

²⁹ Matthew of Edessa, *Chronique de 952 à 1136*, tr. E. Dulaquier (Paris, 1858) (hereafter Matthew of Edessa), 182; Bryennius, 93; Anna Comnena (as in note 17 *supra*), III, 27, 29, 199–203. A detailed account is to be found for Gregory Pacurianus in L. Petit, "Typikon de Grégoire Pacourianes pour le monastère de Petritzos (Bačkovo) en Bulgarie," supplement to *VizVrem*, XI (1904), 54–56; Vakalopoulos, *op. cit.* (*supra*, note 14), II₁, 62ff.

nians as of the Turks, and there is also reference to the presence of a limited number of Georgian nobles among the Turks.³⁰ Representatives of the Byzantine military and land-owning aristocracy are in evidence throughout Seljuk and early Ottoman society. The Gabras family furnished three generations of emirs to the twelfth-century Seljuks.³¹ Members of the Maurozomes clan maintained official connections, both administrative and marital, with the Turkish courts from the twelfth through the fourteenth century.³² Scions of the Comnenus and Taronites clans appear in the service of the Anatolian Turks,³³ and representatives of the Palaeologus, Angelus, Cantacuzenus, Comnenus, and Chalcocondyles dynasties in the service of the Ottomans in the Balkans.³⁴ Greek landed magnates preserving their old Byzantine titles, continued to exist in thirteenth-century Seljuk domains, and one such appears with a Seljuk title and an official costume in a cave mural of the thirteenth century.³⁵ These Armenian, Greek, Slav, and Albanian feudal lords figured prominently in the early Ottoman magnate class. Such were the Mihaloglu, the various *tekfur's* of Bithynia, the Glavas of Thessaly, Laskarids of Avlona, Kurtiks and Arianites of Albania, etc.³⁶ Consequently, as previously mentioned, this Christian aristocracy partly survived the conquests. It is interesting that

³⁰ Matthew of Edessa (as in note 29 *supra*), 195, 199, 205–206, 209–210; I. Melikoff, *La geste de Malik Danişmend* (Paris, 1960) (hereafter *Danişmend*), I, 126, 128–129; Bar Hebraeus (as in note 21 *supra*), I, 265; Michael the Syrian (as in note 21 *supra*), III, 247; M. Brosset, *Histoire de la Géorgie depuis l'antiquité jusqu'au XIX^e siècle* (St. Petersburg, 1849), I, 331.

³¹ Nicetas Choniates, 245–246; Cinnamus, 56; Bar Hebraeus (as in note 21 *supra*), I, 330. It is interesting that one member of the family was martyred for the faith by the Turks, Papadopoulos-Kerameus, Συμβολαὶ εἰς τὴν ἱστορίαν Τραπεζοῦντος, *VizVrem*, XII (1906), 132–137; Zonaras, III, 739; C. Cahen, “Une famille byzantine au service des Seldjuquides d’Asie Mineure,” in *Polychronion. Festschrift Franz Dölger zum 75. Geburtstag*, ed. P. Wirth (Heidelberg, 1966), 145–149.

³² H. Duda, *Die Seltschukengeschichte des Ibn Bibi* (Copenhagen, 1959) (hereafter Ibn Bibi-Duda), 38, 41, 117–120, 140, 330–331; Vryonis, “Seljuk Gulams and Ottoman Devshirmes,” *Der Islam*, 41 (1965) (hereafter “Gulams”), 232–235; P. Wittek, “L’épitaphe d’un Comnène à Konia,” *Byzantion*, X (1935), 505–515; *idem*, “Encore l’épitaphe d’un Comnène à Konia,” *ibid.*, XII (1937), 207–211; S. Lampros—K. Dyovountiotis, “Γρηγορίου Παλαιμᾶ ἐπιστολὴ πρὸς Θεσσαλονίκεῖς,” *Νέος Ἑλληνουνήμων*, XVI (1922), 11.

³³ Nicetas Choniates, 48–49, 72; Lampros-Dyovountiotis, *op. cit.* (*supra*, note 32), 13. Other examples of Greek nobles as Turkish officials during the Seljuk period appear in the vaqf documents. A. Temir, *Kırşehir emiri Caca Oğlu Nur el-Din'in 1272 tarihli Arabca-Mogolca vakfiyesi* (Ankara, 1959), 123, mentions the Emir Constantine of Iskilib and Esed ud-devle Constantine in Kayseri; Turan, *Selçuklular* (as in note 11 *supra*), 227, 233, mentions the patricius Michael son of Maurus, and the son of the patricius Ioanes. S. Lampros, ‘Η Ἑλληνικὴ ὡς ἐπίσημος γλῶσσα τῶν Σουλτάνων, *Néos Ἑλληνουνήμων*, V (1908), 48, a Kyr Alexius was the ambassador of the Seljuk sultan to the kingdom of Cyprus.

³⁴ M. Gökbilgin, *XV–XVI asırlarda Edirne ve Paşa livâsi vakıflar-mülkler-mukataalar* (Istanbul, 1952) (hereafter *Edirne*), 89, 93, 106–107, 151–152; R. Anhegger and Inalcık, *Kânunnâme-i sultâni ber müceb-i örf-i osmâni. II Mehmed ve II Bayezid devirlerine ait yasağname ve kânunnâmeler* (Ankara, 1956), 73–74; F. Babinger, “Beiträge zur Geschichte des Geschlechtes der Malqoč-Oglus,” 355–369, “Beiträge zur Geschichte von Qarly-Eli vornehmlich aus osmanischen Quellen,” 370–377, “Eine Verfügung des Paläogenen Châss Murâd-Paşa,” 344–354; all of these essays are reprinted in *Aufsätze und Abhandlungen zur Geschichte Südosteuropas und der Levante* (hereafter *Aufsätze*) (Munich, 1962), I.

³⁵ Turan, *op. cit.* (*supra*, note 33), 227. N. and M. Thierry, *Nouvelles églises rupestres de Cappadoce, région du Hasan Dağı* (Paris, 1963), 105, 202. The title, emir ariz, indicates an important official position; see I. Uzunçarşılı, *Osmâni devleti teşkilâtına medhal* (Istanbul, 1944) (hereafter *Medhal*), 105.

³⁶ Arnakis, *op. cit.* (*supra*, note 5), 89; E. Frances, “La féodalité byzantine et le conquête turque,” *Studia et acta orientalia*, IV (1962), 69–90; Inalcık, “Stefan Duşan’dan Osmanlı İmparatorluğuna. XV asırda Rumeli’de hıristiyan sipahiler ve menşeleri,” in *Fatih devri üzerinde tarihikler ve vesikalalar* (Ankara, 1954) (hereafter “Duşan’dan”), 142–143, 146–147, 158–162.

a number of their titles were absorbed into Turkish: *effendi*, *despina*, *patrik*, *kyra*, *arhon*, *knez*, *voyvod*, etc.

The peasant class of Asia Minor and the Balkans remained, though there was extensive displacement, particularly in Anatolia. I shall return to the problem of the Christian peasantry in discussing demography and ethnography. The Christian urban class survived in many cities, though it largely disappeared in others. The Christian artisans, merchants, and physicians continued, though the intellectuals were adversely affected and many of them fled.

Despite the fact that various social classes of Christian society experienced adversity, the Turks of the eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth centuries in Asia Minor and of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries in the Balkans ruled compact groups of Christian urban and rural population. It was basically these social classes that gave the Turkish states a style and coloration which differed sharply from those of the Islamic states ruling Egypt, Syria, Iraq, and Iran. It was due to these Christian populations that Turkish society was to a certain degree Byzantinized so that at the moment of genesis of this new Turko-Muslim civilization in Asia Minor and the Balkans the Islamic superstructure rested on Byzantine foundations. These different Christian classes retained the age-old traditions of Byzantino-Armenian and Byzantino-Slavic culture, which they now contributed to the crucible in which Turkish culture was forged.

The topic of Byzantine influence on the Turkish political, military, administrative, fiscal, and numismatic institutions (all of which were formally Islamic) is as yet insufficiently and unevenly investigated. The Seljuk and Ottoman courts were, theoretically, subject to outside influences via four channels. There were occasionally sultans and princes who spent time in the company of Byzantine rulers in Constantinople and Nicaea. Such, for instance, were Kilidj Arslan II, his son Giyath ed-Din Kaihusrau I, Izz ed-Din Kaikaus II, of whom the two latter were half-Greeks, or *mixovarvaroi*.³⁷ A second channel through which such influences might have penetrated into Turkish court life was marriage alliance. Numerous were the Seljuk, Danishmendid, emirate, and Ottoman rulers who took Christian wives: Kilidj Arslan II, Giyath ed-Din Kaihusrau I, Ala ed-Din Kaikubad I, and Giyath ed-Din Kaihusrau II, the last of whom had one Greek, one Georgian, and one Türkmen wife. The subsequent intrigue indicates that Kaihusrau's domestic tranquility was inversely related to the ethnic variety of his harem.³⁸ The Türkmen princes of northern Anatolia took Trapezuntine princesses to wife, as did the Ak Koyunlu and Karaman princes.³⁹ The Ottomans in particular satisfied their diplomatic and

³⁷ Nicetas Choniates, 156–157; Ibn Bibi-Duda (as in note 32 *supra*), 38, 274, 282–283. Alexius III acted as baptismal sponsor of and adopted Giyath ed-Din Kaihusrau I; Acropolites, *Chronice syngraphhe*, ed. E. Heisenberg (Leipzig, 1903), I, 14.

³⁸ Nicetas Choniates, 689–690; Ibn Bibi-Duda (as in note 32 *supra*), 37–38, 204, 210, 278, 313; William of Rubrick, *Itinerarium*, ed. P. A. van den Wyngaert, in *Sinica Franciscana*, I (Florence, 1929) (hereafter William of Rubrick-Wyngaert), 330.

³⁹ O. Lampsides, Μιχαήλ τοῦ Παναρέτου περὶ τῶν μεγάλων Κομνηνῶν, Ἀρχεῖον Πόντου, XXII (1958) (hereafter Panaretus-Lampsides), 70, 72, 74; E. Rossi, *Il "Kitab-i Dede Qorqut" racconti epico-cavallereschi dei Turchi Oguz tradotti e annotati con "facsimile" del ms. vat. turco 120* (Vatican City, 1952).

personal needs with Byzantine and Serbian princesses.⁴⁰ Could women of the harem exercise influence on court life and, if so, did they? They certainly did in terms of its everyday activity, but in regard to custom and ritual, it is harder to answer the question. Izz ed-Din II, whose mother was the daughter of a Greek priest, held a court which was run by his two maternal uncles and their influence and Christian orientation were such that there was a sharp and dangerous split between Muslims and Christians in the dynastic politics of Konya. The Byzantine influence was quite strong at his court. He was not only secretly baptized (Ramazan and Karaman princes were also baptized), but revered the holy icons, and seems to have had close relations with the Greek hierarchy.⁴¹ When Orhan married the daughter of Cantacuzene the Byzantine imperial ceremony of *prokypsis* was lavishly performed before the mixed Greek and Turkish parties attending the nuptials. She herself refused to convert to Islam and actively aided the Christian community of Bithynia which was undergoing strong proselytizing pressures.⁴²

The presence of Christian aristocrats at the court (some of whom converted) certainly constituted natural links between Byzantine practices and Turkish courts. The three Gabras who served as Seljuk emirs, the nephew of John II Comnenus who married the daughter of Kilidj II Arslan and turned Muslim, the great Emir Maurozomes in the thirteenth century, the two uncles of Izz ed-Din, Michael Palaeologus, who waxed so powerful in his brief but important stay at Konya, and others too numerous to mention could have been instrumental in Seljuk contact with Byzantine influences. Finally, there were the *gulam's* or royal slaves, usually of Christian origin, who staffed the court, administration, and select military bodies. The question arises whether these *gulam's*, usually taken at a young age and converted within a rigidly Islamic institution, really had enough of a Christian character to exercise any Byzantine influence on the empire's life. Undoubtedly most did not. Yet, a few examples spring to mind which indicate that many of them (especially those taken at a somewhat more advanced age) had personality traits which in part were explicable only by their Christian background. By way of example: Mehmed Sökölli, the renowned grand vizir of the sixteenth century who was a product of the *devshirme*, resurrected the Serbian patriarch and appointed a relative of his as its first patriarch. Ibrahim Pasha, the most powerful of all the sixteenth-century vizirs, was of a Constantinopolitan Greek family and it is interesting that he collected ancient pagan statuary. Bartholomaeus Geur-

32; A. Bombaci, *Storia della litteratura turca dell'antico imperio di Mongolia all' odierna Turchia* (Milan, 1956), 222; I. Melikoff, "Géorgiens Turcomans et Trébizonde: Notes sur le 'Livre de Dede Qorqut,'" *Bedi Karthlisa*, XVII–XVIII (1964), 21–22; *idem*, *Danişmend* (as in note 30 *supra*), I, 99–100; Bertrandon de la Broquière, *Le voyage d'outremer de Bertrandon de la Broquière*, ed. C. Schefer (Paris, 1892) (hereafter Bertrandon de la Broquière-Schefer), 90.

⁴⁰ Nicephorus Gregoras, III, 504; F. Babinger, "Witwensitz und Sterbplatz der Sultanin Mara," *Aufsätze*, I, 340–344.

⁴¹ Ibn Bibi-Duda (as in note 32 *supra*), 265; William of Rubrick-Wyngaert (as in note 38 *supra*), 330; Pachymeres, I, 131, 263–268; Nicephorus Gregoras, I, 95.

⁴² John Cantacuzene, II, 588–589; M. Andreeva, "O tseremonii 'prokipsi,'" *Seminarium Kondakovianum*, I (1927), 157–173.

geuiz remarks that many of the Janissaries carried the gospel of St. John in Greek and Arabic under the armpit as an apotropaic device against evil! Particularly interesting in this respect is the history of the Greek and especially the Trapezantine *gulam*'s with which Mehmed II filled the saray. They were extremely powerful in imperial affairs and through them their Christian relatives were able to control patriarchal elections and politics. Their influence was so great and so disruptive that later Ottoman legislation temporarily barred the Trapezantine youths from the *devshirme*. Finally, the repeated mention of newly collected *devshirme*'s who attempted to flee the system indicates that many had firm attachments to their Christian communities.⁴³

The visits of Turkish sultans to the Byzantine court, intermarriage with Christian princesses, Christians or converts in high offices, and the *gulam* institution brought a very definite Christian atmosphere and element into the most intimate aspects of court life, but if this demonstrates clearly that there were avenues through which Christian influence might have affected the form of court institutions, it tells us nothing specific. Here and there one detects concrete examples of a definite Turkish taste for the Byzantine court style. The sultan Izz ed-Din, we are told, wore as symbolic of the sultanic authority the ἔρυθροβαφές πέδιλον, the scarlet boot.⁴⁴ Turkish emirs of the realm had a special liking for Byzantine ceremonial robes in the eleventh and twelfth centuries and the emir of Ankara, in a treaty with Alexius III Angelus, demanded as part of the terms forty silk garments of the type manufactured in Theban workshops for the Emperor himself. The gold and silk tissue of the Sultan Kaikobad I in the museum at Lyon is, according to some art historians, fashioned in a modified Byzantine style. A rare Seljuk coin of the twelfth century depicts the sultan in Byzantine imperial garb. Linguistically the Turkish term *killer*, used to designate the sultan's pantry, is of Byzantine origin. The ceremonial life of the Seljuks and Ottomans awaits further research; so with these few and brief observations, I relinquish the problem.⁴⁵

The evidence for Turkish military life is more considerable. The Seljuk armies were, from early times in their Anatolian experience, of a highly diverse ethnic character. They included Turks, Arabs, Persians, Georgians, Armenians, Russians, Franks, and Greeks. In short, they were similar to the multinational

⁴³ Bartholomaeus Georgieuz-Gouge (as in note 12 *supra*), chapter entitled, "Of the Unmerciful Tribute Exacted at the Christian Handes"; Vakalopoulos, *op. cit.* (*supra*, note 14), II₁, 163–164; Vryonis, *op. cit.* (*supra*, note 32), 246–247; Uzunçarsılı, *Ottoman devleti teşkilatından kapukulu ocakları* (Ankara, 1943) (hereafter *Kap. ocak.*), I, 19; L. Hadrovics, *Le peuple serbe et son église sous la domination turque* (Paris, 1947), 48–50.

⁴⁴ Pachymeres, I, 131–132.

⁴⁵ Attaliates, 277; Nicetas Choniates, 608–609, ...σηρικοῖς τεσσαράκοντα νήμασιν, ἀπερ ἐκ Θηβῶν ἐπιτοπύλων βασιλεῖ κεχορήγηται. Von Falke, *Kunstgeschichte der Seidenweberei*, I, fig. 162, and Inalcık, "Harir," *EI*₂, reproduce the Seljuk silk of Lyon. Victoria and Albert Museum, *Brief Guide to Turkish Woven Fabrics* (London, 1950), 1–3; Gordlevsky, *op. cit.* (*supra*, note 11), I, 187ff., on Seljuk court practices, see Köprülü, "Bizans" (as in note 5 *supra*), 268ff.; G. Meyer, *Türkische Studien*, I. *Die griechischen und romanischen Bestandtheile im Wortschatze des Osmanisch-Türkischen. Sitzungsberichte der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, Philos.-Hist. Classe, CXXVIII (Vienna, 1893) (hereafter *Türk. Studien*), 37, 44. K. Dilger, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des osmanischen Hofzeremoniells im 15. und 16. Jahrhundert* (Munich, 1967), stresses the Islamic origin of Turkish court ceremonial, but he does not exclude the possibility of Byzantine influence.

armies of the caliphate and Byzantium. Armenian military contingents, led by Armenian patricians, served the Seljuks in the late eleventh and early twelfth centuries in eastern Anatolia.⁴⁶ Nicephorus Gregoras relates that the sultans recruited military corps of Greek Christians from among the Greeks inhabiting the Seljuk domains and that these served under their own generals with their own uniforms. It was these troops over which Michael Palaeologus was appointed *kondistabl* when he fled to Konya.⁴⁷ The survival of Christian military groups and their incorporation into the Ottoman war machine are phenomena which have received considerable and detailed study and have been rightly stressed as elements which helped make possible the rapid military conquests of the Ottomans, who, without auxiliary manpower, would not have been numerous enough to take and hold their vast empire. Early in the Bithynian conquests of Osman Byzantine feudal lords joined the Ottoman armies, the most famous of them—Mihal Beg—forming one of the longest lived Muslim aristocratic dynasties. The fully developed Ottoman military institutions of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries contained very significant Christian contingents in the martolos, voynuks, Eflaks, and derbentdjis (of the 832,730 Christian hearths recorded for tax purposes in the Balkans during the sixteenth century, 7,851 were voynuk, 82,692 were martolos and Eflak). These groups, as a formally recognized part of the Ottoman *asker* class and enjoying certain tax exemptions, apparently retained a number of their pre-Ottoman military officers. Halil Inalcık, the foremost authority on the institutional history of the early Ottoman period, has concluded that these various Christian military groups, along with the Christian *spahis*, constituted the majority of Ottoman military forces in the Balkans toward the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries.⁴⁸ This raises the problem, much discussed recently, of the possible relation between the Byzantino-Slavic and Ottoman military fief, to wit, the *pronoia* and *timar*. In the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries the Turks established the *timar* as a basic military, fiscal, and administrative institution in the Balkans. In its essentials the Ottoman *timar* was identical with the Byzantine *pronoia*. It was a revenue producing grant, usually but not exclusively of land, the recipient of which, the *spahi*, was entitled to hold it in usufruct in return for military service. The basic difference between *timar* and *pronoia* was a function of the reverse fortunes of centralized authority in the Byzantine and Ottoman states. The sultan exercised strict control of these fiefs, whereas in Byzantium decentralization of imperial authority was reflected in the increasing passage of *pronoia* from the category

⁴⁶ Matthew of Edessa (as in note 29 *supra*), 199, 205–206, 209–210; Ibn Bibi-Duda (as in note 32 *supra*), 97, 216, 219–220, 223, 227–230, 233, 334, 336.

⁴⁷ Nicephorus Gregoras, I, 58.

⁴⁸ Inalcık, "Duşan'dan," (as in note 36 *supra*), *passim*; *idem*, *Hicri 835 tarihli süret-i defter-i sancağı Arnavid* (Ankara, 1954); *idem*, "Timariotes chrétiens en Albanie au XV^e siècle," *Mitteilungen des österreichischen Staatsarchivs*, 4 (1952), 118–138. B. Cvetkova, "Novye o khristianakh-spakhiakh na balkanskom poluostrove v period turetskogo gospodstva," *VizVrem*, XIII (1958), 184–197, gives additional Balkan literature on the subject of the Christian *spahis*. Barkan, "Essai" (as in note 13 *supra*), 34; R. Anhegger, "Martoloslar hakkında," *Türkiyat Mecmuası*, VII–VIII (1940–42), 282–320; M. Vasić, "Die Martolosen im osmanischen Reich," *Zeitschrift für Balkanologie*, II (1964), 172–189. On the derbentdjis, see C. Orhonlu, *Osmanlı imparatorluğunda derbend teşkilatı* (İstanbul, 1967).

of usufruct to that of dominium. It is of further interest that the Ottomans incorporated a number of the old Serbian and Greek *pronoiaroi* as Christian *spahis*, converting their *pronoias* into *timars*. During the fifteenth century the proportion of Christian to Muslim *timar* holding *spahis* in the Balkans varied from about 50 per cent in the district of Branicheva to 3.5 per cent in that of Vidin. The *liva* of Arnavud ili had 60 Christian *timars* out of a total of 335, Tirhala 86 of 182 (in the year 859), etc. The Byzantine magnate-soldiers of Bithynia who joined the Ottomans were also allowed to retain their lands and castles, and this occurred elsewhere in Asia Minor (Paipert, Kutahya, etc.). A number of tax practices associated with the old *pronoia* system seem to have been incorporated when the Ottomans absorbed the Christian *spahis* into the *timar* establishment.⁴⁹

But do these constitute coincidences of the incidentally similar, or was the *timar* more intimately related to the *pronoia*? I do not propose to give a definitive answer to the question for this is not yet possible. However, a brief glance at the Islamic nomenclature for such military grants is not without some significance. *Timar*, of Persian origin, and *pronoia* have very similar meanings and underwent parallel semantological developments. They signify "care, providence, and finally a revenue granted by the ruler to the military and administrative officials for services rendered to the state." It seems that the Ottomans were the first of the Islamic peoples to employ the term *timar* with this last meaning. The Persians had previously used the Arab term *iqta*, as did the Seljuks of Anatolia.⁵⁰ With the appearance of the Mongols and rise of the Türkmen tribal confederations in eastern Anatolia new terms, *tiyul* and *siyurgal*, appeared, but not *timar*.⁵¹ Now, this fact is of interest if we keep in mind a point which I mentioned earlier: that the Seljuks encountered Byzantine society at one stage of its development in the eleventh century, whereas the Ottomans of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries encountered

⁴⁹ Inalcık, "Duşan'dan" (as in note 36 *supra*), *passim*; G. Ostrogorsky, *Pour la féodalité byzantine* (Brussels, 1954), 257.

⁵⁰ J. Deny, "Timar," *EI*, derived the *timar* from the *pronoia*, as does Arnakis, *op. cit.* (*supra*, note 5), 103–104. Gordlevsky, *op. cit.* (*supra*, note 11), I, 101–103, and Köprülü, "Bizans" (as in note 5 *supra*), 219–240, in deriving the Ottoman *timar* from the Seljuk *iqta*, rely on the fifteenth-century Turkish text of Yazidzioglu Ali rather than on the thirteenth-century Persian text of Ibn Bibi. Hence their conclusion is not completely satisfactory, for where Ibn Bibi uses the term *iqta*, Yazidzioglu had used *timar*, which was current in the fifteenth century. In addition, the Persian texts of Chahar Maqala, Nerchaky, and Ibn Bibi, to which Köprülü refers in the note on page 239, do not use *timar* as a *terminus technicus* to designate *iqta*. My colleague Prof. Amin Banani, who very kindly examined the Persian texts, informs me that contrary to Köprülü's assertion, the word *timar* in these texts has the generic meaning of surveillance or care.

For the *iqta*, see A. K. Lambton, "The Evolution of the 'Iqta' in Medieval Iran," *Iran*, V (1967), 41–50; C. Cahen, "L'évolution de l'*iqta*' du IX^e au XIII^e siècle," *Annales: Economies, Sociétés, Civilisations*, 8, No. 1 (1953), 25–52. The Rum Seljuks apparently utilized the term *iqta* rather than *timar*. Uzunçarşılı, *Medhal* (as in note 32 *supra*), 123–124, asserts that the Rum Seljuks officially used *iqta*. He refers to Ibn Bibi-Duda (as in note 32 *supra*), 174, to show that the common people of the Seljuk kingdom used *timar*, but the text reads *iqta* rather than *timar*. See also the remarks of V. P. Mutafčieva, "Sur le caractère du *timar ottoman*," *Acta Orientalia*, IX (1959) (hereafter "Timar"), 55–61, and Cvetkova, "Influence exercée par certain institutions de Byzance et des pays balkaniques du Moyen âge sur le système féodal ottoman," *Byzantino-Bulgarica*, I (1962) (hereafter "Influence"), 243.

⁵¹ W. Hinz, *Irans Aufstieg zum Nationalstaat im fünfzehnten Jahrhundert* (Berlin-Leipzig, 1936), 107.

the same society at a later stage of development. The *pronoia* system was still in its infancy in the eleventh century and the Seljuks did not encounter it within their Anatolian domains. The Ottomans expanded into Bithynia in the early fourteenth century, and then into the Balkans, by which time the *pronoia* system had spread throughout both the Byzantine domains and those of the South Slavs. This coincidence between the geographical diffusion of the *pronoia* institution and of the term *timar* is indeed striking and would reinforce the evidence for a hypothesis of the *timar*'s Byzantine origin. But the Seljuk *iqta* must still be considered a possible source of the Ottoman *timar* until the problem is settled by more detailed research.

The role of the Byzantines in the Turkish fleets would be one which by the nature of things we would be more inclined to suspect. The Turks developed in central Asia, Iran, and the central Anatolian plateau, all landlocked areas, whereas the Byzantines carried on a maritime tradition dating back many centuries. It was the Greeks and Italians from whom the Turks learned of maritime life. The evidence is scant for the Seljuk period, but it supports such an assumption as does the rich maritime lexicography which passed into Turkish very often via Greek.⁵² When the Turkish ruler of Smyrna, Tzacha, set out to conquer the Ionian coast and isles he relied upon Smyriotes to build his fleet, and other emirs utilized the Byzantine shipyards of Cius.⁵³ More specific information has been discovered in a Turkish *tahrir* for Gallipoli dated 1474. It records that there were three *djemaa't*'s of Greeks at this important Ottoman naval base: one of rowers, one of arbaletiers, and one of ninety-five Greeks for the repair and building of ships.⁵⁴ Christians and renegades remained important to Ottoman naval enterprise throughout its long history.

The old Byzantine and Balkan scribal classes, both on the local level and in the capital, continued to function in an official capacity as part of the Muslim state apparatus, a phenomenon which recalls the Persian, Greek, and Copt scribes in the Umayyad administration. Under the Seljuks these scribes constituted the *notaran* and a limited number of their documents survive. As a result of the numbers of Christian subjects over whom the beyliks and Ottoman Empire ruled and because of the importance of Byzantine and Slavic tax practices the Christian scribal class remained an important element in the Ottoman administration.⁵⁵ The contemporary observer Bartholomaeus Georgenau describes the Ottoman scribal class as follows:

⁵² H. and R. Kahane and A. Tietze, *The Lingua Franca in the Levant* (Urbana, 1958). For the Byzantine background, see Koukoules, *op. cit.* (*supra*, note 5), V, 331–386, and H. Ahrweiler, *Byzance et la mer* (Paris, 1966).

⁵³ Anna Comnena (as in note 17 *supra*), II, 68–69, 110–114. The Seljuk chronicler, Ibn Bibi-Duda (as in note 32 *supra*), 283, uses the Byzantine term *katirga* to denote a ship.

⁵⁴ Inalcık, "Gelibolu," *EI*2.

⁵⁵ Ibn Bibi-Duda (as in note 32 *supra*), 67. The thirteenth-century tetrevangelion in the Gennadius Library, MS. Gr. 1.5, is signed by a protonotarius of Caesarea. Lampros, *op. cit.* (*supra*, note 33), *passim*. Turan, *Türkiye Selcukluları hakkında resmi vesikalalar* (Ankara, 1958), 109–114. Bombaci, "Nuovi firmani greci di Maometti II," *BZ*, 47 (1954), 298–313; *idem*, "Il liber graecus, un cartolario veneziano comprendente inediti documenti ottomani in greco (1481–1504)," *Westöstliche Abhandlungen* (Wiesbaden, 1954), 301–302; Chalcocondyles, 501; E. Zachariadou, Μία Ἑλληνόγλωσση συνθήκη τοῦ Χηδὴρ Ἀιδίνογλου, *BZ*, 55 (1962), 245–265.

"IAZITI. Iaziti are divers scribes in the courts of turkische princes, howbeit they use sondrye languages and letters. For in Turkiye they speake and write with their propre spech and letters. In Grece and Italye with the toungue and letters of the Grecians. But in Pannonia and Moldavia are accustomed in writing and language and letters of the Rascians."⁵⁶

These Christian secretaries continued in the palace service of the sultans and in the provinces played a prominent role in dressing the cadastral surveys for the fisc.⁵⁷ During the early Turkish period in Anatolia the Turks adopted the Byzantine practice of sealing their documents with lead seals, some of which continued to employ Christian iconography.⁵⁸ The Islamic style of composing financial registers (*siyaqat*) was not introduced into Seljuk Anatolian domains until the thirteenth century,⁵⁹ and there are indications that Byzantine practices may have been employed in the preceding interval (a point to which I shall return in discussing Turkish taxation).⁶⁰

The fiscal policies of the Seljuk and Ottoman sultans in newly conquered lands were largely motivated by the desire to restore order to these lands so that the conquerors could enjoy their economic exploitation. Inasmuch as both Anatolia and the Balkans had possessed socio-economic structures which were convenient for such exploitation, the conservative sultans adapted these to their own needs. The tax forms which evolved in Anatolia and the Balkans were extremely varied and complex, including as they did elements from the Islamic, Mongol, Byzantine, Armenian, and Slavic tax systems.⁶¹ The Seljuks and Ottomans often preserved and continued the tax practices of the lands which they conquered; so the Ottoman empire had no detailed uniform tax structure. This conservative fiscal policy is revealed in an incident which Nicetas Choniates relates in the late twelfth century. At that time the sultan

⁵⁶ Bartholomaeus Georgieuiz-Gouge (as in note 12 *supra*), s.v.

⁵⁷ Inalcık, "Conquest" (as in note 16 *supra*), 111.

⁵⁸ P. Casanova, "Numismatique des Danichmendites," *Revue numismatique*, XIV (1896), 309–310.

⁵⁹ Ibn Bibi-Duda (as in note 32 *supra*), 345.

⁶⁰ Nicetas Choniates, 656–657; Cahen, "Le régime de la terre et l'occupation turque en Anatolie," *Cahiers d'histoire mondiale*, II (1955), 95.

⁶¹ The best and most detailed treatment of this bewildering subject is Inalcık, "Osmanlılar'da raiyyet rüstümü," *Belleten*, Türk Tarih Kurumu XXIII, 92 (1959) (hereafter "Rüstüm"), 575–610. See also Barkan, *XV ve XVI asırlarda osmanlı imparatorluğununda zirai ekonominin hukuki ve mali esaslari* I, *Kanunlar* (İstanbul, 1945) (hereafter *Kanunlar*); Cvetkova, "L'évolution du régime féodal turc de la fin du XVI^e jusqu'au milieu du XVIII^e siècle," *Etudes historiques*, I (1960), 171–206; Mutafčieva, *Agrarnite otnoshenia v osmanskata imperiya prez XV–XVI v.* (Sofia, 1962); *idem*, "Kategoriite feodalno zavisimo naselenie v nashte zemi pod turska vlast prez XV–XVI v.," *Izvestija na instituta za istorija*, VIII (1960), 57–93; Djurdjević, "Die Kanunname der Osmanen und ihre Bedeutung für die Wirtschaftsgeschichte der Balkanländer," *Godishnjak istoriskog drustva Bosne i Hercegovina*, VII (1965), 5–15; H. Hadžibegić, "Džizja ili harac," *Prilozi za orientalnu filologiju i istoriju jugoslovenskih naroda pod turksom vladavinom*, V (1954–55), 46–102; Barkan, "894 (1488–1489) yılı cizyesinin tahsilatına ait muhasebe bilançoları," *Belgeler*, I (1964), 1–120.

For Ottoman taxes in Greek lands, see J. Kabrda, 'Ο τουρκικός κώδικας (kanunname) τῆς Λαμίας, 'Ελληνικά, XVII (1962), 202–218, and Vakalopoulos, *op. cit.* (*supra*, note 14), II, 21–39. In Bulgaria: Mutafčieva, "De l'exploitation féodale dans les terres de population bulgare sous la domination turque au XV^e et XVI^e s.," *Etudes historiques*, I (1960), 145–170; Cvetkova, "Contribution à l'étude des impôts extraordinaires (avariz-i divaniye ve tekâlif-i örfiye) en Bulgarie sous la domination turque. L'impôt nuzul," *Rocznik orientalistyczny*, XXIII (1959), 57–65; *idem*, "Recherches sur le système d'affermage (iltizam) dans l'Empire Ottoman au cours du XVI^e–XVIII^e siècles par rapport aux contrées bulgares," *ibid.*, XXVII (1964), 111–132.

raided the two Greek comopoleis of Tantalus and Caria located on tributaries of the Maeander, kidnapped their population (*ca.* 5,000 souls) and resettled them in the depopulated regions of Philomelium. He had them carefully guarded en route so that none might escape, then had a detailed register drawn up recording their number, possessions, livestock, and finally gave them land and seed to plant. He granted them a five-year tax immunity with the provision that afterward they should pay exactly those taxes which they had been accustomed to pay to the Byzantine emperors in their Byzantine habitat.⁶² We find the same policy, centuries later, in an incident which Critobulus describes. When Mehmed II first appeared before the important Serbian city of Novobrdo he offered terms to the inhabitants which included the provision that "...they should pay those same taxes which they (had paid) to their own king."⁶³

Studies of the early Ottoman *tahrir defters* demonstrate the generally conservative Ottoman stance vis-a-vis the older tax structure and practices (*adet-i kadimiyye*) and illustrate a Turkish system riddled with taxes of non-Turkish origin. When, after the conquest of a given area an economic survey or *tahrir* was drawn up, the Turkish emir who supervised this important survey had the scribes (frequently Christians or renegades) note local tax practices and differences in tax rates. Then, after approval and adjustment by the sultan, these were included on the front page of the *defter* as the *kanun-name* or fiscal law of the province.⁶⁴

The Ottoman absorption of Christian *spahis* and *askers*, as well as of the peasant communities subject to their exploitation, resulted in the simultaneous absorption of many of their tax practices. Inalcık, in a daring study, has suggested that the basic agrarian structure of the Ottomans in western Asia Minor and much of the Balkans was directly modeled on that of Byzantium. The basic land tax in species centered about the *chift* or yoke (variously defined as the yoke of oxen which pulled the plow, a farm of the size which a yoke of oxen could service, or a plot of land which could be sown by four mud of seed). This basic tax was the *chift resmi (ispendje)*. The *nim chift* was a half yoke or the equivalent land, a *chiftlü bennak* was less than half; the category *mücerred* included widows and agricultural workers. These Ottoman categories conform to the Byzantine *zeugarion*, *boidaton*, *aktemon*, and, Inalcık continues, the cash payment of each category (Byzantine and Ottoman) was the same. The feudal rent also included payments in kind and corvées which are frequently identical with their Byzantine equivalents and less frequently bear non-Turkish names. Particularly strong was the Byzantine influence in the domain of the Ottoman taxes known under the collective title *avariz-i divaniye ve tekalif-i örfiye*, taxes which the subjects paid to the state rather than to

⁶² Nicetas Choniates, 655–657. Inasmuch as the *siyagat* system of Muslim fiscal administration was not introduced at the Seljuk court until the thirteenth century, it may be that the Rum Seljuks adopted some form of the Byzantine cadastral system.

⁶³ *Critobuli Imbriotae de rebus per annos 1451–1467 a Mechemete II gestis*, ed. B. Grecu (Bucharest, 1963), 185.

⁶⁴ Inalcık, "Conquest" (as in note 16 *supra*), 110–111.

the feudal *spahis*. A fleeting glance at the *termini technici* which passed into Ottoman fiscal parlance from the various subject peoples reinforces these other sources: *Angarya, irgadiyya, sinir, parik* (Greek); *bashtina, gornina, pogaca* (Slavic); *bennak, trngir* (Armenian).⁶⁵

The iconography and metrology of Turkish coinage, alternately, reflect numismatic influence of Byzantium or the Latin Levant. This calls to mind the Arabs who took as models for the dinar, fols, and dirhem the Byzantine aureus denarius, folles, and the Sassanid dirhem.⁶⁶ The earliest Turkish dynasties to strike coins in Anatolia, the Danishmendids, imitated the broad flanned bronze anonymous coinage of the Byzantines, employing Greek as well as Arab inscriptions and such Byzantine iconographic features as St. George, the Virgin, and Christ. The coinage of the Ortokids, Zengids, and Saltukids went even further in imitating the iconography of Hellenistic and Roman coins. When Seljuk coins begin to appear they conformed much more to the Islamic calligraphic style, though there were rare exceptions. The gold and silver coinage of the fully developed Ottoman empire, like that of the caliphate, has obscured its Christian origins behind the calligraphic style, for metrologically the akche seems to derive from the Byzantine aspron and the altun from the Venetian ducat. Like the Arabs, the Turks went through a period of iconographic imitation of Christian coinage before Islamicizing their coins. The emirs of western Anatolia struck imitations of Italian gigliati with Latin inscriptions, and the Ottomans struck imitations of Venetian gold ducats before Mehmed II first minted the epigraphic altun.⁶⁷

Inextricably related to the political and commercial order is the question of law. Legal relations were extremely varied and complex because of the existence of Byzantine, Armenian, Syrian, and Slavic legal codes and customs, all of which had interacted upon one another prior to the Turkish invasions. The Turkish legal structure was not subject to such fundamental influence from outside as had been early Islamic law under the Umayyads. For by the Turkish period Islamic law had undergone long development with the result that the *sharia* provided a comprehensive system of law through which the life of the Muslim could be regulated. Matters of contracts, marriage, inheri-

⁶⁵ Inalcik, "Taxation" (as in note 28 *supra*), 237–242; *idem*, "Rüstüm," 589; *idem*, "Çiftlik," *EJ* 2; *idem*, "Djizya," *ibid.*; Hinz, "Das Steuerwesen Ostanatoliens im 15. und 16. Jahrhundert," *Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, C (1950), 199–201; Barkan, *Kanunlar*, pp. LXIII–LXXII; Cvetkova, "Influence" (as in note 50 *supra*), 243–257; *idem*, *Izvunredni danutsi i durzhavini povinnosti v bulgarskite zemi pod turska vlast* (Sofia, 1958).

⁶⁶ J. Walker, *A Catalogue of the Arab-Byzantine and Post-Reform Umayyad Coins* (London, 1956); P. Grierson, "The Monetary Reforms of 'Abd al-Malik. Their Methodological Basis and their Financial Repercussions," *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient*, III (1960), 241–264.

⁶⁷ Casanova, *op. cit.* (*supra*, note 58), XII (1894), 307–312, 433–460; XIII (1895), 389–402; XIV (1896), 210–230; I. Ghalib Edhem, *Catalogue des monnaies turcomanes, Beni Ortok, Beni Zengui, Frou' Atabegyeh et Meliks ayoubites de Maiyafarikin* (Constantinople, 1894), 7, 30, 31, pls. I, no. 6, II, no. 32; A. Tevhid, *Meskukat-i kadime islamiye katalogu* (İslambol, 1321), IV, pls. I, no. 92, III, no. 120, VII, no. 90; J. Karabacek, "Gigliate des ionischen Turkomanenfürsten Omar-beg," *Numismatische Zeitschrift*, 2 (1870), 525–538; *idem*, "Gigliate des karischen Turkomanenfürsten Urchân-bej," *ibid.*, 9 (1877), 200–215; W. Hinz, "Hyperper und Asper. Zur vorosmanischen Währungskunde," *Der Islam*, 39 (1964), 79–89; F. Babinger, *Reliquenschächer am Osmanenhof im XV. Jahrhundert. Zugleich ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der osmanischen Goldprägung unter Mehmed II dem Eroberer. Sitzungsberichte, Jahrgang 1964, Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philos.-hist. Klasse. Heft 2* (Munich, 1956).

tance, presentation of evidence in court, etc. were intricately worked out. Though we know little of Byzantine influence on Turkish law, there is some evidence of the existence of such influences on a limited scale, particularly in Ottoman penal law, where double penalties and certain types of mutilation, so common in Armenian, Byzantine, and Slavic law, seem to have been adopted.⁶⁸ Payment of blood money in case of murder is also in evidence, but whether this is a survival of the Slavic *vrazda*-Byzantine φονικόν or simply a legal practice which the Turks brought with them is not clear.⁶⁹ In the realm of what one might describe as commercial law the Ottomans adopted the mining law which they found regulating the Serbian mining industry. This code was primarily Saxon in origin, the so-called *kanun-i-sas*, with a small admixture of Byzantino-Serbian elements.⁷⁰ Continued research on commercial, agricultural, and craft regulations will undoubtedly reveal further influences of pre-Turkish legal codes, for the economic domain was more subject to local influence than was the domain of private life which was so closely governed by religious codes. Community life was almost hermetically sealed off in religious zones, whereas economic life cut across sectarian lines.

The economic life of the Seljuks and Ottomans, except for the nomadic sector, was very heavily indebted to the economic forces and forms of the Christian populations. The influence of these Christians is everywhere obvious in agriculture, crafts, commerce, and maritime life. The importance of these Christians in the agricultural domain arises from the very obvious fact that the bulk of the Turks who came to Anatolia in the early years were nomads and as such they practiced marginal agriculture or in some cases no agriculture whatsoever. The basic farming stock of Seljuk Anatolia up to the mid-thirteenth century consisted of Greek, Armenian, Georgian, and Syrian peasants. After the thirteenth century the majority of these farmers were converted to Islam and these converts, along with the sedentarized nomads, came to constitute the Turkish farming population of most of Anatolia. The policies of colonization which the sultans pursued in the twelfth century clearly indicate the almost exclusive predominance of Christians in the category of peasant farmers. Without going into all the details of this colonization one sees the various Seljuk and Danishmendid rulers kidnapping large masses of Christian farmers not only from the Byzantine and Armenian held Anatolian domains, but even from each other's kingdoms. There were numerous military campaigns between the Seljuks and Danishmendids in which the one attempted to coerce

⁶⁸ M. Begović, "Tragovi nasheg srednjevekovnog krivichnog prava u turškim zakonskim spomenitsima," *Istoriski casopis*, VI (1956), 1-21. Bertrand de la Broquière-Schefer (as in note 39 *supra*), 115, the fifteenth-century prince of Karaman (born of a Christian mother and baptized) applied mutilation of hands, feet, and nose as penalties.

⁶⁹ G. Rouillard and A. Soloviev, "Τὸ φονικόν: Une influence slave sur le droit pénal byzantin," in Μνημόσυνα Παππερύλια (Athens, 1934), 221-232; A. Mirambel, "Blood Vengeance (Maina) in Southern Greece and among the Slavs," *Byzantium*, XVI (1944), 381-392; M. Tourtoglou, Τὸ φονικόν καὶ ἡ διπολημίωσις τοῦ παθόντος (Athens, 1960); P. Charanis, "The Phonikon and other Byzantine taxes," *Speculum*, XX (1945), 331-333.

⁷⁰ N. Beldiceanu, *Les actes des premiers sultans conservés dans les manuscrits turcs de la Bibliothèque Nationale à Paris II. Réglements miniers 1390-1512* (Paris, 1964); N. Radojičić, *Ius metallicum despotaie Stephani Lazarević* (Belgrade, 1962).

the other to relinquish these kidnapped Christian farming populations. I have already referred to one specific instance in which the sultan took away 5,000 Greek farmers and brought them to Philomelium. But frequently the numbers involved were much larger.⁷¹ The importance of the more highly developed Byzantine agriculture is obvious in the occasional reliance of the thirteenth-century Seljuks upon grain imports from the kingdom of Nicaea.⁷² In a series of remarkable philological studies Andreas Tietze uncovered a very important lexicographical stratum of Greek loan words in the Turkish *kaba dil* of Anatolia which deals with agricultural and rural life. This philological evidence, which indicates a strong Byzantine influence on Turkish rural life and which consequently corrects the earlier assumption of the philologist Gustave Meyer that Byzantine influence on the Turks was restricted to the urban and commercial life, reinforces the evidence of the historical texts.⁷³ We may, therefore, conclude that Byzantine agrarian practices and techniques strongly determined Turkish agricultural life in Anatolia. The case in the Balkans is much more obvious. Here the majority of the agrarian population was always Christian, and the Muslim farmers who settled in the Balkans were already themselves the products of a Byzantine agricultural environment in Anatolia.

Moving from agriculture to crafts and industry, two distinct questions are raised: Did local craft traditions and techniques continue alongside those brought by Islamic craftsmen who emigrated from the Near East to Anatolia and the Balkans? Did local elements in the organization of the guilds survive in the guilds of the Seljuks and Ottomans?

Pre-Turkish Anatolia possessed an urban populace which was highly skilled in the exercise of the crafts, a tradition which existed in the Roman period as well. These Anatolian craftsmen were proficient parchment makers, painters, masons, shipbuilders, potters, makers of glass and incense makers, makers of bows, arrows, swords, shields, naval supplies, renowned jewellers, metal-workers, miners, plasterers, woodworkers, textile and carpet weavers.⁷⁴ The

⁷¹ Michael the Syrian (as in note 21 *supra*), III, 206, 245, 246, 346, 388; Bar Hebraeus (as in note 21 *supra*), I, 264, 296; Nicetas Choniates, 163, 481, 523, 655–657; Cinnamus, 198.

⁷² Nicephoras Gregoras, I, 42–43; Theodore Scutariotes-Sathas (as in note 26 *supra*), 507.

⁷³ A. Tietze, "Griechischen Lehnwörter im anatolischen Türkisch," *Oriens*, 8 (1955) (hereafter "Lehnwörter"), 204–257; *ibid.*, *Actes du X Congrès international d'études byzantins*, 1955 (Istanbul, 1957), 295 ff.; *idem*, "Einige weitere griechische Lehnwörter im anatolischen Türkisch," *Nemeth Armağani* (Ankara, 1962), 373–388; see also Theodoridis, *op. cit.* (*supra*, note 11), *passim*. The strong element of continuity in Byzantine agricultural technology is to be seen in the present-day Anatolian threshing sledge, the *düğen*—δουκάνη. The *düğen* consists of long wooden boards with teeth of flint or iron on the underside, and the farmer usually rides on the topside as the animal drags it over the harvested grain. It is attested in antiquity as the τρίβολος; see K. D. White, *Agricultural Implements of the Roman World* (Cambridge, 1967), 152–156, 191; T. Mommsen and H. Blumner, *Der Maximatarif des Diocletian* (Berlin, 1958), 33, 141. For a detailed description of this threshing sledge in sixteenth-century Anatolia, see Hans Dernschwam's *Tagebuch einer Reise nach Konstantinopel und Kleinasiien* (1553/55), ed. F. Babinger (Munich-Leipzig, 1923) (hereafter Hans Dernschwam), 27, 182–183, 184, 198, 253. For a photograph of the *düğen* employed in present-day Anatolia, see X. de Planhol, *De la plaine pamphylienne aux lacs pisidiens. Nomadisme et vie paysanne* (Paris, 1958), pl. xxiii; H. Koşay, "Türkiye halkının maddi kültürüne dair araştırmalar," *Türk etnografiya dergisi*, I (1956), 25–26, and pls. iv–v.

⁷⁴ T. R. S. Broughton, *Roman Asia Minor*, in *An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome*, ed. T. Frank (Baltimore, 1938), 419–918, is a rich source of factual information on Anatolian economic life during

technical skills of these Rum were highly praised by Arab geographers, and the tenth-century traveller Ibn Fadlan found the court of one of the central Asiatic Turkic rulers furnished with Armenian carpets and Byzantine textiles.⁷⁵ If one examines the sparse sources for Seljuk and early Ottoman Anatolia, it becomes obvious that the Christians continued to cultivate their economic specializations. Let us begin with the Anatolian textile industry. I have already had occasion to mention the taste which the Anatolian Turks displayed for Byzantine textiles. Marco Polo, who travelled through Anatolia, noted, with the keen perceptiveness of the merchant:

"In Turcomania there are three classes of people. First there are the Turcomans; these are the worshippers of Mahomet, a people with an uncouth language of their own. They dwell among mountains and downs where they find good pastures, for their occupation is cattlekeeping. Excellent horses, known as Turquans, are reared in their country, and also very valuable mules. The other two classes are the Armenians and Greeks, who live mixed with the former in the towns and villages, occupying themselves with trade and handicrafts. They weave the finest and handsomest carpets in the world, and also great quantities of fine and rich silks of cramoisy and other colors, and plenty of other stuffs."⁷⁶

Other travellers in Anatolia also testify to the continued presence of Christian weavers in the Anatolian textile industry. Ibn Battuta observed the Greek weavers of Laodiceia, in whose shops "...are manufactured cotton fabrics edged with gold embroidery, unequalled in this kind, and long-lived on account of the excellence of their cotton and the strength of their spun thread Most of the artisans there are Greek women who are subject to the Muslims and who pay dues to the sultan, including the *jizya*, and other taxes."⁷⁷ This Arab traveller also mentions the making of fabrics in Erzinjian, a city inhabited primarily by Armenians. Christian weavers were active in thirteenth-century Melitene, and, during the ceremonies celebrating the marriage alliance of the Germiyanids and Ottomans, linens were sent from Laodiceia and cloth from the still Byzantine city of Philadelphia.⁷⁸ The famous Ottoman silk in-

the Roman and early Byzantine periods. See also Vryonis, "Problems" (as in note 6 *supra*), 130–131. V. Minorsky, "Marvazi and the Byzantines," *Annuaire de l'institut de philologie et d'histoire orientales et slaves*, X (1950), 458, writes that the Byzantines are "...gifted in crafts and skillful in the fabrication of (various) articles, textiles, carpets." They are second only to the Chinese in these skills (a theme which reappears in the Mathnawi of Djelal ed-Din Rumi).

⁷⁵ Ibn Fadlan-Togān (as in note 11 *supra*), 64; R. Ettinghausen, "Kali," *EI*, Supplement, 106–111; I. Manandian, *O torgovle i gorodakh v sviazi s mirovoi torgovlei drevnikh vremen* (Erevan, 1954), 228–229; Minorsky, *Hudūd al-'Alam. The 'Regions of the World'; a Persian Geography*, 372 A.H.–982 A.D. (London, 1937), 156.

⁷⁶ *The Book of Ser Marco Polo the Venetian concerning the Kingdoms and Marvels of the East*, tr. and ed. H. Yule, 3rd ed. (New York, 1903), I, 43; A. C. Moule and P. Pelliot, *Marco Polo, the Description of the World* (London, 1938), I, 95; F. Sarre and H. Trenkwald, *Altorientalische Teppiche* (Vienna-Leipzig, 1928), II, 17, no. 17.

⁷⁷ Ibn Battuta-Gibb (as in note 25 *supra*), II, 425. The textiles of the city were already well known in antiquity, Broughton, *op. cit.* (*supra*, note 74), 819–820.

⁷⁸ Ibn Battuta-Gibb (as in note 25 *supra*), II, 437; Bar Hebraeus (as in note 21 *supra*), I, 408. *Tevarih-i Al-i Osmandan Ashikpashazade tarihi*, ed. 'Ali Bey (Istanbul, 1332) (hereafter *Ashikpasha-zade*-'Ali Bey), 56.

dstry of Bursa was located in a region which had possessed a lively textile industry since the days of John Vatatzes.⁷⁹ In the sixteenth century the commercial agent of the powerful house of Fugger, Dernschwam, noted that the working of the famous Angora wool into camlet was largely in the hands of the Greeks of Konya, Kayseri, and Siwas.⁸⁰

There is considerable evidence that side by side with Muslim architects, painters, and masons, their Christian and converted counterparts were active in Anatolia and the Balkans. Perhaps the best known of these Christian architects was the Greek from Konya, Kaloyan al-Qunewi, who worked on the Ilgin Han in 1267-8 and three years later built the Gök *medresse* of Sivas.⁸¹ In 1222 the Greek architect Thyriannus built the mosque in the village of Nidir Köy near Akshehir, and a certain Sebastus took part in rebuilding the walls of Sinope in 1215 after its capture from the Greeks.⁸² The dervish literature of the Mevlevi, Bektashis, and Shabaniyye frequently refers to Christian masons and architects who were employed by these orders.⁸³ Fascinating, but insufficiently studied, are the scores of stone masons' markings on Seljuk buildings, many of which are, unmistakably, letters of the Greek alphabet.⁸⁴

⁷⁹ Inalcık, "Harir," *EI*, 2; Nicephorus Gregoras, I, 43; M. Schneider, *Die römischen und byzantinischen Denkmäler von Izmir-Nicaea* (Berlin, 1943), 5.

⁸⁰ Hans Dernschwam (as in note 73 *supra*), 186, "Die zamlet, wie obstat, seindt von obstandeten gaisheren gespunnen. Haben nur krichn (Greeks) gesehen, die sie wyrkhen, waschen, syeden und wasser (?) driken under ainer pres."

⁸¹ *Répertoire chronologique d'épigraphie arabe*, eds. E. Combe, J. Sauvaget and G. Wiet (Cairo, 1943) (hereafter *RCEA*), XII, 164-165; A. Gabriel, *Monuments turcs d'Anatolie* (Paris, 1934) (hereafter *Monuments*), II, 155-161; K. Erdmann, *Das anatolische Karavansaray des 13. Jahrhunderts* (Berlin, 1961) (hereafter *Karavansaray*), I, 199; M. F. Grenard, "Note sur les monuments seldjoukides de Siwâs," *Journal asiatique*, 9th Ser., XVI (1900), 456-458.

⁸² L. A. Mayer, *Islamic Architects and their Works* (Geneva, 1956), 119; *RCEA* (as in note 81 *supra*), X, 116; N. Bees, *Die Inschriftenaufzeichnung des Kodex Sinaiiticus Graecus 508 (976) und die Maria Spiläotissa Klosterkirche bei Sille (Lykaonien). Mit Exkursen zur Geschichte der Seldschukiden-Türken* (Berlin, 1922) (hereafter *Spiläotissa*), 53-54; I. H. Konyalı, *Nasreddin Hocanın şehri Akşehir* (Istanbul, 1945), 549.

⁸³ Efaki, *Les saints des derviches tourneurs*, tr. C. Huart (Paris, 1918-1922) (hereafter *Efaki-Huart*), II, 2, 275-276; E. Gross, *Das Vilayet-name des Haggi Bektash. Ein türkisches Derwischevangelium* (Leipzig, 1927) (hereafter *Vilayetname-Gross*), 151-152; H. J. Kissling, "Şa'bân Velî und die Şa'bâniye," *Serta Monacensis* (Leiden, 1952), 91.

⁸⁴ Erdmann, *Karavansaray* (as in note 81 *supra*), I, *passim*. Many of these markings are identical with letters in the Greek alphabet and might possibly suggest that Greek stone masons were employed in construction work along with Muslim masons. Such seem to be the following: ΜΠΔΕΑΝΚΞΙΒΥΖΛΥ. Gabriel, *Monuments* (as in note 81 *supra*), *passim*; R. Nour, "Tamga ou tag, marque au fer chaud sur les chevaux à Sinope," *Journal asiatique*, CCXII, No. 2 (Jan.-June 1928), 148-151, compares some of the markings to horse brands, and suggests that the masons' markings are partly Turkish, partly Greek in origin. On the Christian masons in the nineteenth century, see W. Ramsay, *The Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia* (Oxford, 1895), I, 302. On the famous architect Keluk ibn Abdulla, a convert to Islam and possibly of Armenian origin, see *RCEA* (as in note 81 *supra*), XII, 22-24; Mayer, *op. cit.* (*supra*, note 82), 77. The question of Christian influence on Turkish architecture is a vast topic which awaits investigation. Gabriel generally took a negative view on this question: "Bursa'da Murad I camii ve osmanlı mimarisinin menşei meselesi," *Vakıflar Dergisi*, II (1942), 37-43; *idem*, *Monuments*, I-II. Erdmann, "Zur türkischen Baukunst seldschukischer und osmanischer Zeit," *Istanbuler Mitteilungen*, 8 (1958), 6-7, takes the view that the Rum Seljuks abandoned many of the traditional architectural forms and created new types. This was due, he says, to the Byzantine milieu. See also Taeschner, "Beiträge zur fröhosmanischen Epigraphik und Archäologie," *Der Islam*, 20 (1932), 117. On specific examples of Byzantine architectural influence, see: J. M. Rogers, "The Cifte Minare Medrese at Erzerum and the Gök Medrese at Sivas. A Contribution to the History of Style in the Seljuk Architecture of Thirteenth-Century Turkey," *Anatolian Studies*, British Institute of Archaeology at Ankara, XV (1965), 76; "Annual Report," *ibid.*, XV (1965), 12, on the Byzantine

Greek painters are also in evidence in thirteenth-century Anatolia. Their works can be seen in the rupestrian churches of the thirteenth century, and in miniatures, but more interesting is their presence in the Seljuk court and in Muslim dervish circles.⁸⁵

Christian potters and tile workers participated in the famous ceramic industry of Kutahya and Bithynia;⁸⁶ Greeks and Armenians were especially prominent in mining, metalwork, and jewelry. The Armenians of Erzinjan made metal vessels of the copper which they mined, and the Greeks of Pontus were active in the Ottoman mining industry for centuries.⁸⁷ The Greek goldsmiths of Trebizond were especially famous and Selim I learned their craft from a Greek master craftsman of Trebizond while he was serving his political apprenticeship as governor of the district.⁸⁸ Timur transplanted many of these Greek and Armenian gold- and silversmiths and craftsmen to Samarkand after the battle of Angora in 1402.⁸⁹ The most sensational object of this Christian metalwork in Muslim Anatolia is, of course, the famous Ortakid enamel bowl.⁹⁰

round arch, masonry, and construction to be found in Ottoman architecture of Iznik and Bursa. Diez, "Kubba," *EI*, Supplement. See the interesting anecdote in Eflaki-Huart (as in note 83 *supra*), II, 208, on the preferability of Greek to Turkish masons.

⁸⁵ Eflaki-Huart (as in note 83 *supra*), I, 333–334; II, 69. The two Greek painters Kaloyani and Ain ed-Daula Rumi were intimates of the Seljuk court and of the dervish circles. See R. Ettinghausen, *Turkish Miniatures* (New York, 1965), 8–9, on the Byzantine affiliations of miniatures, in Bibliothèque Nationale MS. 174, executed in Aksaray in 1271 and dedicated to the Seljuk sultan; also, E. Blochet, *Les enluminures des manuscrits orientaux de la Bibliothèque Nationale* (Paris, 1926), pls. 18, 19; *idem*, *Muslim Painting XIIth–XVIIth Century* (London, 1929), pl. xxxiv. Plates LV and LVI, from the manuscript of Rashid ed-Din's history, depict angels in the Byzantine manner. See also F. Babinger, "Mehmed's II. Heirat mit Sitt-Chatun (1449)", *Der Islam*, 29, 2 (1949), 230–231, and plate 7 which reproduces a portrait of Sitt Hatun done by a Greek painter.

⁸⁶ Ashkashazade-Ali Bey (as in note 78 *supra*), 12, where we learn that the Christians of Bilecik specialized in the manufacture of cups which they sold at the weekly fairs of Eskishehir. There is a reference to a lively commerce in pottery in this area already during Byzantine times; see Nicholas Mesarites' travel report addressed to the monks of the Evergetis Monastery in Constantinople (A. Heisenberg, *Neue Quellen zur Geschichte des lateinischen Kaisertums und der Kirchenunion*, Sitzungsberichte der bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philos.-hist. und philol. Klasse [Munich, 1923], II, 44). Evliya Chelebi mentions that there was a special quarter of Christian tile workers in the city of Kutahya during the seventeenth century, *Seyahatnamesi*, IX, (Istanbul, 1935), 19, "Cinici keferler mahallesi...." For examples of specifically Christian tiles, see C. Nomikos, *Χριστιανικά κεραμουργήματα* (Alexandria, 1922); *idem*, 'Η λεγομένη Ροδισκή όγγειοπλαστική (Alexandria, 1919). There are examples in the Armenian Patriarchate of Jerusalem, the Benaki Museum in Athens, and the Victoria and Albert Museum in London. Though the style of Ottoman tiles does not betray any Christian stylistic influence, there seems to have been some continuity of technique in Seljuk Anatolia; see H. H. van Osten, *The Ahişar Hüyük Season of 1930–32, Part III* (Chicago, 1937), 205. On Turkish pottery, see K. Otto-Dorn, *Türkische Keramik* (Ankara, 1961). For Islamic influence on Byzantine pottery, see D. Talbot Rice, "Late Byzantine Pottery at Dumbarton Oaks," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 20 (1966), 207–219.

⁸⁷ Vryonis, "The Question of the Byzantine Mines," *Speculum*, XXXVII (1962) (hereafter "Mines,") 10; R. M. Dawkins, *Modern Greek in Asia Minor* (Cambridge, 1916), 6–8; Ibn Battuta-Gibb (as in note 25 *supra*), II, 437.

⁸⁸ L. A. Mayer, *Islamic Metalworkers and their Works* (Geneva, 1959), 16. On the fame of the Trapezuntine jewelers, see Evliya *op. cit.* (*supra*, note 86), II (1896–97), 91.

⁸⁹ Gonzales de Clavijo, tr. Le Strange, *Embassy to Tamerlane 1403–1406* (London, 1928) (hereafter Clavijo-Le Strange), 288.

⁹⁰ R. Ettinghausen, E. Akurgal, and C. Mango, *Treasures of Turkey* (1966), 167–168; M. von Berchem and J. Stryzgowski, *Amida* (Heidelberg, 1910), 120–128, 348–354; H. Buchthal, "A Note on Islamic Enamelled Metalwork and its Influence on the Latin West," *Ars Islamica*, XI–XIII (1946), 198; O. von Valke, "Kupferzellenschmelz im Orient und in Byzanz," *Monatshefte für Kunstschaft*, II (1909), 32ff.; L. A. Mayer, *Saracenic Heraldry* (Oxford, 1933), 102.

In the Balkans the pre-Ottoman traditions of the crafts and industry had undergone extensive development, especially in Byzantium proper, but also in Serbia and Bulgaria. Constantinople, Thessaloniki, Thebes, and Corinth were renowned for the products of their craftsmen and the admixture of Italian skills must have added to this richness. As a consequence of the Ottoman conquest Muslim craftsmen settled in the Balkan towns where they joined the Christian craftsmen, with the consequence that there was the same ethno-religious variety in the artisan classes here that we saw in Anatolia.

Through their crafts and occupations concerned with the sea the Christians made a major contribution to the formation of Ottoman maritime life. The shipbuilders, oarsmen, fishermen, and artisans in the naval arsenals were frequently Greeks, Italians, or renegades. The association of Greek sponge fishermen from the Dodecanese, which Evliya Chelebi describes in the procession of seventeenth-century Istanbul guilds, was of a tradition already grown old when Pliny described these sponge fishermen in the years of the Roman Empire.⁹¹

The mines of Serbia and Byzantium continued to operate in Ottoman times, according to the old pre-Ottoman regulations, and the miners were largely Christians.⁹² The Greek jewelers and goldsmiths of Istanbul enjoyed a considerable reputation, while Christian architects and masons also remained active and, because of this, Ottoman mosques, hammams, and especially domestic architecture (of the solarium type) betray Byzantine influences. Christian textile workers, furriers, and physicians were similarly prominent.⁹³ The strong influence of the Byzantine craft-industrial legacy on the Seljuks and Ottoman craft techniques seems undeniable, though one is faced with a further and yet unanswered question: To what extent did the Christian craftsman preserve in their creations the Byzantine style and, conversely, to what degree did they employ their skills and techniques to create objects in Islamic style. In addition, one must ask, were elements of the Byzantine style thereby incorporated into what emerged as an Ottoman style?

We have not yet considered the relation of the Byzantine to the Turkish guilds. The guild system of fourteenth-century Anatolia and of the later period in the Balkans included those which were exclusively Muslim, those

⁹¹ *Natural History*, ed. XXXI, 131; Kahane and Tietze, *op. cit.* (*supra*, note 52), *passim*; R. Mantran, *Istanbul dans la seconde moitié du XVII^e siècle* (Paris, 1962), 386, 416–417. Inalcık, “Gelibolu,” *EI*, 2. S. Papageorgiou, “Οδοιπορικὸν Ἰακώβου Μηλοίτη,” *Παρασάσσος* (1882), 636, quotes the following interesting comment by the sixteenth-century traveller Jacob Meloites on the sponge industry of Simi in the Dodecanese, . . . εὐρίσκομε μία νῆσος δύναμιτι Σήμι καὶ ἔχει ἔνα κάστρο καὶ κατοικοῦσι πάντες “Ελληνες καὶ ή τέχνη αὐτῶν ὑπάρχουσι πάντες βουτοῦσι εἰς τὰ βαθη τῆς θαλάσσης ἔως 25 εἴκοσι πέντε δρυγιαῖς, καὶ ἐβγάνουσι τὰ σφογγάρια, καὶ ὅπο ἔκεινης ἔρχονται τὰ σφογγάρια στὴν Βενετίαν.

⁹² Beldiceanu, *op. cit.* (*supra*, note 70); R. Anhegger, *Beiträge zur Geschichte des Bergbaus im osmanischen Reich*, I: *Europäische Türkei* (Istanbul, 1943); V. Gordlevsky, “Eksplotatsiiia nedr zemli v Turtsii,” *Sovetskoe Vostokovedenie*, III (1945), 109–145; A. Refik, *Osmanlı devrine Türkiye madenleri 967–1200* (Istanbul, 1931); Vryonis, “Mines” (as in note 87 *supra*), 11–17; C. Jireček, *Die Handelsstrassen und Bergwerke von Serbien und Bosnien während des Mittelalters* (Prague, 1879); D. Kovačević, “Dans la Serbie et la Bosnie médiévaux: Les mines d’or et d’argent,” *Annales: Economies, Sociétés, Civilisations*, 15, No. 2 (1960), 248–258.

⁹³ Mantran, *op. cit.* (*supra*, note 91), 419, 449, 497–498; J. Sourdel-Thomine, “Hammām,” *EI*, 2.

which were exclusively Christian, and guilds which were interdenominational.⁹⁴ To what degree Christian guild regulations were preserved and passed on to the Turkish system it is difficult to say, but the existence of purely Christian and mixed guilds, as well as of guilds the chiefs of which were Christians or converts, was strongly favorable toward continuity in guild regulation and organization. The problem has a somewhat simpler solution if one can accept the recent conclusion of one scholar, who declares that the Islamic world had no guilds prior to the establishment of the Turks in Anatolia and the Balkans. This would imply a Byzantine origin for Ottoman and Seljuk guilds.⁹⁵ However, it is difficult to believe that the highly developed urban life and crafts of the Islamic towns were devoid of such formal organization according to associations. In the Anatolian towns, during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, the craftsmen had associations which were, in addition, penetrated by the Islamic ideology of *futuwwa*. These *futuwwa* groups were probably an Islamic elaboration and version of the older Byzantine faction—*neaniai*, which had dominated urban life in the sixth-century Levantine towns. Consequently, the Anatolian guild-*futuwwa* complex possibly reflects both a direct and indirect Byzantine influence.⁹⁶ All this points to strong similarities between Byzantine and Seljuk-Ottoman urban life and towns. Many Byzantine and some Balkan towns retained their old forms, others were destroyed, and some were heavily recolonized by Turks and converts. But the Byzantine and the Turkish town (the so-called oriental town) were virtually identical, each possessing a central agora, or *charshiya*, with the guildsmen's shops and warehouses, groups of administrative buildings and palaces, separate quarters for religious and ethnic groups, and, of course, religious buildings. The organization of public order and economic life under the control of the eparch and *muhtesib* were strikingly parallel and possibly of common origin, as was also the system of nocturnal police patrols.⁹⁷

⁹⁴ Mantran, *ibid.*, 349–394. On election of a convert as guild *kethuda* in Sofia, see G. Galabov and H. Duda, *Die Protokollbücher des Kadiamtes Sofia* (Munich, 1960), 134, for converts in guilds, 158, and esp. 215; Ibn Battuta-Gibb (as in note 25 *supra*), II, 425, 427, 437–438; Eflaki-Huart (as in note 83 *supra*), II, 14, 317–320.

⁹⁵ For a specific example of Ottoman adoption of Byzantine regulations, see Taeschner, "Das bosnische Zunftwesen zur Türkenzzeit (1463 bis 1878)," *BZ*, 44 (1951), 557–559. Taeschner points to two basic differences between Ottoman and Byzantine guilds: The Byzantine guilds, in contrast to the Ottoman, were under the strong central control of the government. Though this may have been the case in the tenth century for Byzantium, one could hardly say that in the eleventh and twelfth centuries the Byzantine guilds were responsive to centralized control; see Vryonis, "Byzantine Δημοκρατία and the Guilds in the Eleventh Century," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 17 (1963), 287–314. With the decline of the empire it may be that the control of the central government continued to relax. For the second point of difference—the *futuwwa* influence on Anatolian Turkish guilds—see note 96 *infra*; S. Goitein, *A Mediterranean Society. The Jewish Communities of the Arab World as Portrayed in the Documents of the Cairo Geniza* (Berkeley-Los Angeles, 1967), 82–83.

⁹⁶ Taeschner, "Akhi," *EI*2; "Futuwwa, eine gemeinschaftsbildende Idee im mittelalterlichen Orient und ihre verschiedenen Erscheinungsformen," *Schweizerisches Archiv für Volkskunde*, LII (1956), 144–151; Cahen, "Sur les traces des premiers achis," *Fuad Köprülü Armağani* (Istanbul, 1953), 81–91; Vryonis, "Byzantine Circus Factions and Islamic Futuwwa Organizations (*neaniai*, *fitiyān*, *ahdāth*)," *BZ*, 58 (1965), 46–59.

⁹⁷ See Cvijić, *op. cit.* (*supra*, note 7), 191–206, for a description of the "Turco-byzantine" town, as in contrast to other Balkan types. H. Grégoire, "Les veilleurs de nuit à Trébizonde," *BZ*, 18 (1909), 490ff.; G. Marçais, "Considérations sur les villes musulmanes et notamment sur le rôle du Mohtasib,"

Toynbee, in one of his many perceptive insights, has attributed the commercial pre-eminence of the Phanariot class to the "stimulus of penalization." There is no doubt an element of truth in his proposition that the Greeks, excluded from the political hegemony, channelled their energies into endeavors which were still open to Christians, namely commerce. However, the importance of Armenians, Syrians, Greeks, Slavs, and Vlachs in the commercial life of the Seljuk and Ottoman states represents less the consequence of this "stimulus of penalization" than a continuity of their active commercial role in Byzantine times. The commercial life of these Christians suffered temporary disruptions in periods of turmoil, but with the re-establishment of order, they returned to their enterprises. With the gradual stabilization of conditions in twelfth-century Anatolia, the Greek merchants of Konya and Pousgousae reappear in the caravan trade between Konya and Constantinople—western Anatolia. In the east Armenians and Syrians reacted similarly to stabilized conditions, and we have an archaeological monument testifying to their activity, a caravansary built by a Christian with inscriptions in Syriac, Armenian, and Arabic.⁹⁸ In the Balkans this Christian merchant class not only survived, but became increasingly powerful. One need only mention Michael Cantacuzene in the sixteenth century and the later Manolakis Castorianos, head of the powerful corporation of fur merchants. This latter organization donated, annually, one-tenth of its income to support the Orthodox Patriarchate of Jerusalem against the growing influence and intrigues of the Catholic Church in the Holy Places.⁹⁹ But what of Byzantine commercial institutions per se? One of the most lively survivals was the Byzantine commercial-religious panegyris, which Martin Nilsson has convincingly derived from the ancient Greek pagan panegyris. At the time of the Seljuk and Ottoman invasions the panegyris was a widespread and deeply rooted institution throughout Anatolia and the Balkans.¹⁰⁰ These panegyreis were discontinued in many areas because of the destructiveness of the first Turkish invasions,¹⁰¹ but they eventually recovered and we see that Turkish merchants are participants in the great commercial panegyris of the Archangel Michael at Chonae in the later half of the twelfth century. From this time, and especially in the Ottoman Empire somewhat later, the panegyris remained a very important commercial institution. The very word *panair* passed into Turkish with a host of other commercial loan words.¹⁰²

La ville, pt. 1, *Institutions administratives et judiciaires*, Recueils de la société Jean Bodin, VI (1954), 260–261; Gaudefroy-Demombynes, "Un magistrat: le mohtesib," *Journal des savants* (1947), 36–40.

⁹⁸ Nicetas Choniates, 50, 653–654; Bar Hebraeus (as in note 21 *supra*), I, 454; Erdmann, *Karavansaray* (as in note 81 *supra*), I, 63–67.

⁹⁹ T. Stoianovich, "The Conquering Balkan Orthodox Merchant," *Journal of Economic History*, XX (1960), 234–313; N. Iorga, *Byzance après Byzance* (Bucarest, 1935), 114, 121, 223.

¹⁰⁰ M. Nilsson, *Greek Popular Religion* (New York, 1947), 97–101; Koukoules, *op. cit.* (*supra*, note 5), III, 270–283.

¹⁰¹ The Turkish conquests disrupted the panegyris of St. Eugenius in Trebizond and of St. Phocas in Sinope for extensive periods of time; see Papadopoulos-Kerameus, *Sbornik istochnikov po istorii trapezundskoi imperii* (St. Petersburg, 1897). I, 59; C. Van de Vorst, "Saint Phocas," *Analecta Bollandiana*, XXX (1911), 289.

¹⁰² On restoration of the Trapezuntine panegyris, see Papadopoulos-Kerameus, *op. cit.* (*supra*, note 101), I, 65; also S. Lampros, Μιχαήλ Ἀκομινάτου τοῦ Χωνιάτου τὰ σωζόμενα (Athens, 1879), I,

It is clear that Byzantine (Armeno-Syro-Byzantine and Slavo-Byzantine) agricultural, industrial, and commercial life were fundamental in the formation, techniques, and the very personnel of Seljuk and Ottoman institutions. The economic impact of Byzantium in the Ottoman period further emerges from the fact that the influx of Persian and Arab craftsmen evident in the Seljuk period was renewed only after the conquest of the Mameluke and a portion of the Safavi domains in the sixteenth century and, therefore, considerably after the initial consolidation of Ottoman institutional life under Mehmed II. It is true, however, that the later influx of the Muslim craftsmen, as well as of the Sephardic Jews, brought new traditions into this economic life.

All of the Byzantine influences described above were transmitted not as abstract ideas or by unmanned institutions, but by people, and at this point we must consider the demographic and ethnographic aspect of this impact. Anatolia on the eve of the Seljuk invasions was a comparatively compact demographic region inhabited primarily, though not exclusively, by Greek and Armenian speaking populations. Some scholars, arguing, *ex post facto*, from the predominantly Islamic character of sixteenth-century Anatolia, have suggested that Byzantine Anatolia in the eleventh century was demographically semidesolate, and that the Arab *razias* had largely destroyed the peasant stock. But this Islamic character of sixteenth-century Anatolia has obscured the fact that eleventh-century Anatolia had for some time developed free from and unhindered by massive Arab raids. The expansion of the *notitia episcopatum*, the land hunger of the magnates, the earlier separation of the *caput* from the *iugum* in the tax structure all reflect demographic growth. Finally, the sources speak of substantial and numerous towns with compact village clusters. The demography of the Balkans on the eve of the conquest is more difficult to assess, and certainly large areas of the Balkans in such regions as Bosnia were still underdeveloped. However, Bulgaria, and especially Serbia, began to experience a lively urban development. Whatever the demographic situation prior to the conquest, in Ottoman times the Christians far outnumbered the conquerors in the Balkans.¹⁰³

In Anatolia the Greek and Armenian speakers were to constitute a substantial and important element in the rise and formation of the Anatolian Turkish population. Intermarriage at all levels of society was very frequent from the eleventh to the fifteenth century, a fact reflected in both the Greek and Turkish contemporary sources. Anna Comnena, writing two generations after the invasions, refers to the numerous offspring of these mixed marriages as the

56, on the revival of the panegyris of the Archangel Michael at Chonae in the twelfth century. "Ελκει γάρ, οὐ μέγα είπειν, τὰς περιοικίδας ἀπάσας πόλεις ἀλλ' ἔτι γε δὴ καὶ τοὺς ἐξ ὑπερορίων Λυδούς τε καὶ Ἰωνας καὶ Κάρας καὶ Παμφύλους καὶ Λυκίους, πρὸς δὲ καὶ βαρβάρους ἰκνούσις ἐνεκά γε τοῦ ἀποδούντα καὶ πρίασθαι. R. Brunschwig, "Coup d'oeil sur l'histoire des foires à travers l'Islam," *La foire*, Recueils de la société Jean Bodin, V (1953), 65-72. See I. K. Vasdravelles, 'Ιστορικά Ἀρχεῖα Μακεδονίας. Β' Ἀρχείον Βεροίας-Ναούσης 1598-1886 (Thessaloniki, 1954) (hereafter, 'Αρχεῖα Β), 86, on the annual fairs in the towns of seventeenth-century Macedonia.

¹⁰³ See notes 157-160 *infra*.

mixovarvaroi. They figure prominently in the armies of both the Byzantines and Seljuks in the twelfth century, and Balsamon notes their curious religious practices.¹⁰⁴ Nicephorus Gregoras noted that the inhabitants of fourteenth-century Bithynia consisted of three categories: Greeks, Turks, and *mixovarvaroi*.¹⁰⁵ The Seljuk sources refer to the *mixovarvaroi* as *igdish*, and once more they are frequently mentioned in the Seljuk armies.¹⁰⁶ Mass conversions, to be discussed at a later point, led to the same result. When in the last century the anthropologist von Luschan studied the cranial index and skeletal measurement of the people of southwest Anatolia, he found that Muslims and Christians in the towns had identical physical measurements, whereas the anthropometry of the Turkish tribal groups differed considerably. Though one must be cautious about physical anthropology because of the many inconstant factors, this is a piece of evidence which seems to corroborate the sources; to wit, that the Christians by conversion and intermarriage affected the physical character of significant portions of the Anatolian populace, particularly in the towns.¹⁰⁷ The Turks in the Balkans were affected by the same conditions, i.e., conversions and intermarriage. In this respect it is interesting to note a practice which was observed in both peninsulas. The Turks were accustomed to take Christian women they desired in a relationship later authors termed *kabin*. According to different versions of this practice the male offspring became Muslim, whereas the daughters could exercise a choice of religion. In one version of this practice, the children born of this union were retained by the father and the mother was returned to the Christian community where she remarried. The Greek patriarchs made strong efforts to halt this widespread practice of *kabin* in the seventeenth century.¹⁰⁸ Slavery and the *devshirme* contributed further to the growth of the Muslims at the expense of the Christians. An Ottoman historian writing two and one-half centuries after the inception of the *devshirme* estimated that over 200,000 Christians were thereby Islamized. As the youths constituted the flower of Christian young manhood their incorporation into the Turkish nation may have had somewhat the effect of selective breeding (to the degree that they produced offspring).¹⁰⁹ The overall effect of Byzantine demography and ethnography was to make of the Turks a people with origins

¹⁰⁴ Anna Comnena (as in note 17 *supra*), III, 205: ήσαν γάρ καὶ τινες ἐν αὐτοῖς μιξοβάρβαροι ἔλληνίζοντες. G. Rhalles and M. Potles, *Σύνταγμα τῶν θείων καὶ ιερῶν κανόνων* (Athens, 1852), II, 498.

¹⁰⁵ Nicephorus Gregoras, I, 379; III, 509.

¹⁰⁶ V. Ménage, "Some Notes on the Devshirme," *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London*, XXIX (1966), 64–78.

¹⁰⁷ E. Petersen and F. von Luschan, *Reisen in Lykien Milyas und Kibyratis* (Vienna, 1889), II, 198–266. Von Luschan had reprinted the study, without the fascinating plates, in "Die Tachtadschy und andere Ueberreste der alten Bevölkerung Lykiens," *Archiv für Anthropologie*, XIX (1891), 31–53.

¹⁰⁸ For details, see N. J. Pantazopoulos, *Church and Law in the Balkan Peninsula during the Ottoman Rule* (Thessaloniki, 1967), 94–102. The Catalan chronicler Ramon Muntaner, *Chronique du très magnifique seigneur Ramon Muntaner*, tr. J. A. C. Buchon, in *Chroniques étrangères relatifs aux expéditions françaises, pendant le XIII^e siècle* (Paris, 1841), 418, remarks that if a Turk wishes to take for wife a Christian, even if she be of a noble family, her relatives must give her to the Turk. If a son is born of this union he must be circumcized and raised as a Muslim, whereas a girl may choose her religion. Vasradvelles, 'Αρχεῖα Β', 2–3. Ludolphus de Sudheim, *De itinere terre sancte*, ed. G. A. Neumann, in *Archives de l'Orient latin*, II (1884), *Documents* (hereafter Ludolph of Sudheim-Neumann), 375–376.

¹⁰⁹ Ménage, "Sidelights on the devshirme from Idris and Sa'duddin," *op. cit.* (*supra*, note 106), XVIII (1956), 183.

as mixed as those of the other Balkan peoples. (They were nonetheless Turks, for it is not "pure blood" which determines ethnic consciousness and affiliation.)

One of the most fascinating phenomena is the influence of Anatolian and Balkan Christianity on Turkish Islam. One would look in vain for any widespread Byzantine influence on the formal religious life of the Seljuks and Ottomans because Islam had long since evolved into a highly structured, articulate, and unbending religious system. It is rather in the more vibrant aspect of Islam, popular Islam or Volksreligion that one must seek out this Christian influence. Hasluck opened the door to this intriguing subject in a memorable work which, unfortunately, has seen no systematic continuation. The persistence of popular religiosity within all formal religious structures is of course a well-known phenomenon; yet, when one pauses to examine the details one is invariably amazed by their freshness and vitality as well as by their grotesqueness. Such is the power of Volksreligion that the formal religious institution either acknowledges it openly or pretends to ignore it and thus absorbs it because it cannot eliminate it. This was characteristic of both the Christian Church and Islam. Christian practices, beliefs, and forms, which are at the basis of a rather substantial portion of popular Turkish Islam, entered Islam as a result of conversions, intermarriage, everyday contact of Muslim and Christian in a cycle of life regulated by ancient custom, and through the religious syncretism of the popular dervish orders. The most vital element in Byzantine popular Christianity was hagiolatry, a phenomenon which markedly affected popular Islam, the Muslims tending to absorb the cults of certain saints by equating the saints with particular Muslim holy men: St. George and St. Theodore with Chidr Elias, St. Nicholas with Sari Saltik, St. Charalampos with Hadji Bektash. Other saints were approached in times of need and peril even if they had no rationalized relationship with a Muslim saint (as for instance St. Amphilius-Plato, St. Eugenius, St. Phocas, St. Michael, St. Photine, St. Mamas, St. John Roussos, etc.).¹¹⁰ One of the most frequently mentioned Christian practices which the Muslims adopted was baptism (*vaftiz*). Balsamon remarks that the Anatolian Muslims baptized their children in the twelfth century: "...It is the custom that all the infants of the Muslims be baptized by Orthodox priests.... For the Agarenes suppose that their children will be possessed of demons and will smell like dogs if they do not receive Christian baptism."¹¹¹

Izz ed-Din the Seljuk sultan had received infant baptism, and Bertrandon de la Brocquiére observed that the Turkmen princes of the Karaman and Ramazan dynasties in southern Anatolia had also been baptized in order to "remove the bad odor."¹¹² De Busbecq a century later indicates that the

¹¹⁰ F. Hasluck, *Christianity and Islam under the Sultans* (Oxford, 1929), I, 17, 48–53; II, 363–367, 432–433, 568–586; Gordlevsky, *op. cit.* (*supra*, note 11), I, 321–361; John Cantacuzene, PG, 154, col. 512. Hans Dernschwam (as in note 73 *supra*), 205.

¹¹¹ Rhalles and Potles (as in note 104 *supra*), II, 498. This is repeated by Armenopoulos, PG, 50, col. 512.

¹¹² Pachymeres, I, 131, 263–268; Nicephorus Gregoras, I, 95; Bertrandon de la Brocquiére-Schefer (as in note 39 *supra*), 90; "Ramadan.....avoit esté filz d'une femme crestienne laquelle l'avoit fait

Muslims continued to baptize their children,¹¹³ and the practice was so common that in the seventeenth century the Greek church forbade priests, under pain of being defrocked, to baptize Turkish children.¹¹⁴ A curious adaptation and with an inversion of its original significance survived among the inhabitants of Ladik (Laodiceia Combusta) in the early twentieth century. These Muslims, who, according to their own traditions, were descendants of the original Christian population, immersed their children in an *ayasma* just outside the town. They did this to prevent their offspring from becoming Christians.¹¹⁵

No less striking is the survival of animal sacrifice which the Christians had practiced in an unbroken fashion since pagan antiquity and the remnants of which are still visible today. The descriptions (for both the Byzantine and Turkish periods) of this θυσία, or *kurban* (in Turkish), are very numerous indeed, and indicate yet one more popular element which the Turks adopted from Byzantium. The most detailed description is given by the sixteenth-century Turkish slave Bartholomaeus Gourgieuz.

"The Manner of their (the Turks') sacrifice.

In the time of anye disease or peril, they promise in certaine places to sacrifice either a Shepe or Oxe; after that the vowed offering is not burned, like unto a beast killed and layed on the aulter, as the custome was among the Jewes, but after that the beast is slaine, the skinne, head, feete, and fourthe parte of the flesh are gene unto the prest, an other part to poore people, and the thirde unto their neighbours. The killers of the sacrifice doo make readye the other fragmentes for the sleves and their compaynions to feede on. Neyther are they bound to performe the vow, if they have not bene delivered from the possessed disease or peril. For all things with them are done condytionallye I will geve if thou willte graunt. The lyke worshyppinge of God is observed among the Gretians, Armenians, and other realmes in Asia imitating yet y Christian religiō."¹¹⁶

Striking is the apportioning of the parts of the sacrificed beast, a division which is similar to the practice of pagan Greek sacrifice. The priest's share, as described by Bartholomaeus, adheres very closely to the so-called δερματικόν as it is described in Greek sacrificial inscriptions of the fourth and third

baptiser à la loy gregiesque pour luy enlever le flair et le senteur qu'ont ceulx qui ne sont point baptisiez."'; p. 115, of the Karamanid, "C'estoit un tresbeau prince de trente deux ans, et estoit bien obey en son pays. Il avoit esté baptisé en la loy grequesque pour oster le flair, aussy duquel la mere avoit esté crestienne, comme on me dist."

¹¹³ Bartholomaeus Georgieuz (sixteenth century) recounts that among the blandishments which his Turkish master proffered to induce him to convert was the similarity of religious practices between Islam and Christianity. This included baptism among the Turks; see F. Kidrić, *Bartholomaeus Gjorjevic: Biographische und bibliographische Zusammenfassung* (Vienna-Prague-Leipzig, 1920), 15, *Tum ille, nos saepius baptizamur, haec verba recitanates, bisem allah alrah man elrahim: id est, in nomine Dei et misericordiae et misericordiarum.* My colleague, Andreas Tietze, has suggested that this may actually refer to the practice of Muslim ablutions rather than to actual baptism.

¹¹⁴ Koukoules, *op. cit.* (*supra*, note 5), IV, 55. The Turks baptized their children: διὰ νὰ μηδὲν ψει-ριάλουν καὶ νὰ μηδὲν κακοπαθοῦν εἰς τὴν περιτομὴν καὶ διὰ νὰ μηδὲ βρωμῇ τὸ κορμὶ αὐτῶν.

¹¹⁵ W. M. Calder, "A Journey round the Proseilemmene," *Klio*, 10 (1910), 233 ff.

¹¹⁶ Bartholomaeus Georgieuz-Gouge (as in note 12 *supra*), under "The Manner of their Sacrifice."

centuries of the pre-Christian era.¹¹⁷ I briefly call attention here to a variety of Byzantine elements in popular Islam which are related to marriage, infant care, the belief in the efficacy of icons and healing earth, and all ceremonies closely connected with the agricultural calendar and the changes in seasons. By way of example, De Busbecq writes that no Turks put to sea until after the Christian Epiphany and the blessing of the waters. The list of such practices is long, but the few examples which I have given will perhaps produce some idea as to their variety and deeply rooted character.

Christian folklore, cuisine, entertainment, and possibly the folk epic exercised varying degrees of influence on Turkish popular society. This is an even vaster topic than that of religion since it deals with the most detailed aspects of daily life. Türkmen cuisine, as described by Brocquière, was a very simple affair consisting largely of the produce of their flocks, i.e., meat, milk, yogurt, butter, cheese, supplemented by millet or other grains, fruit, honey, and eggs, and a type of unleavened wafer (prepared on a portable hot iron in the manner of our own pancakes) in place of bread. The preparation of the unleavened cake was quite different from the baking of bread, and indeed the oven (*furnus*) of the Armenians and Greeks was conspicuously absent.¹¹⁸ It is significant that the Anatolian Turkish terminology for bread and its preparation includes many words of Byzantine origin.¹¹⁹ Much of the so-called and elaborate Turkish cuisine was foreign to the Türkmen nomads and belonged to a sedentary cuisine common to the eastern Mediterranean world since Roman times if not earlier. A brief perusal of the pages of Athenaeus' *Deipnosophistae* will confirm this assertion, for here the gastronomer will find not only stuffed leaves, but also various oriental sweets.¹²⁰ Christian musicians and entertainers contributed to Turkish music and recreation both in Konya and Istanbul.¹²¹ We should not abandon the field of folklore without at least mentioning the probable Byzantine origin of the Turkish Kizil Elma so intimately associated with the great equestrian statue of Justinian and the prophecies and legends attaching to the golden globe which the statue held in its hand.¹²²

¹¹⁷ See the fourth-century inscription (pre-Christian era) from Chios in E. Schwyzer, *Dialectorum graecorum exempla epigraphica potiora* (Leipzig, 1923), no. 695, also nos. 168, 366, 721, 729, 808, and the articles "Dermatikon," and "Opfer," in Pauly-Wissowa. For an example of animal sacrifice in the Byzantine era sanctioned by the church, see F. Cumont, "L'archevêché de Pedachthoe et le sacrifice du faon," *Byzantion*, VI (1931), 521–533; S. Kyriakides, "Θυσία ἐλάφου ἐν νεοελληνικοῖς συναξαρίοις," *Λαογραφία*, VI (1917), 189–215. P. Ricaut, *The Present State of the Greek and Armenian Churches, Anno Christi, 1678* (London, 1679), 371–372, observed this θυσία among the Greeks living in the Ottoman empire. D. Loucopoulos and D. Petropoulos, 'Η λαϊκή λατρεία τῶν Φαράσων (Athens, 1949), 21, 44–49, furnish detailed descriptions of animal sacrifice by the Greek Christians of Cappadocia in the early twentieth century, complete with the δερματικόν, or portion of the priest.

¹¹⁸ Bertrandon de la Broquière-Schefer (as in note 39 *supra*), 91–92; Ibn Battuta-Gibb (as in note 25 *supra*), II, 474; Z. Oral, "Selcuk devri yemekleri ve ekmekleri," *Türk etnografya dergisi*, I (1956), 74.

¹¹⁹ Tietze, "Lehnwörter" (as in note 123 *infra*), *passim*.

¹²⁰ Koukoules, *op. cit.* (*supra*, note 5), V, *passim*.

¹²¹ Pachymeres, I, 129; Mantran, *op. cit.* (*supra*, note 91), p. 500.

¹²² W. Heffening, *Die turkischen Transkriptionstexte des Bartholomaeus Georgievits aus den Jahren 1544–1548. Ein Beitrag zur historischen Grammatik des Osmanisch-türkischen*, in Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes, XXVII, 2 (Leipzig, 1942), 27–37; Dawkins, "The Red Apple," 'Αρχείον τοῦ θρακικοῦ λαογραφικοῦ καὶ γλωσσικοῦ θησαυροῦ, ἐπίμετρον ΣΤ' τόμου (1941), 401–406; J. Deny, "Les pseudo-prophéties concernant les Turcs au XVI^e siècle," *Revue des études islamiques* (1936), 201–220; E. Rossi, "La leggenda turco-bizantina del Pomo Rosso," *Studi bizantini e neoellenici*, V (1937), 542–553.

The incorporation of so many ethnic groups, the conversion of many, the economic importance and specialization of these peoples, all were conditions which favored the absorption of extensive lexicographical material from Armenian, Greek, Slavic, Italian, Magyar, and Rumanian.¹²³ The number of these loan-words may have been greater during the time of initial contact for with the passage of time many no doubt fell out of use. However, the Persian administrative and Arab religious influences, plus the Islamic character of Turkish literature predetermined that the loan-words in Turkish would come primarily from those two tongues. There was little or no direct Christian influence on Turkish literature. Though there were a few translations of Greek texts on the archaeological memorabilia of Constantinople, on the Christian faith, Ptolemy, and some chronicler material, most of the Greek texts which were available to the Turks were those already absorbed into the mainstream of Muslim intellectual life by the Arabs and Persians at an earlier period. The case history of Mehmed II is illustrative in this respect. Because of his interest in the geography of Ptolemy he ordered Amiroutzes to unify and simplify it and then to translate it. But in studying the Greek philosophers, Critobulus relates: "He studied, exceedingly, all the wisdom of the Arabs and Persians and all that of the Greeks which had been translated into Arabic and Persian; I mean the writings of the Peripatus and Stoa, utilizing (for this purpose) the best and wise teachers of the Arabs and Persians in these matters."¹²⁴

Thus, the foreign loan-words which passed into Turkish from the languages of the Christian subjects dealt largely with agrarian, maritime, artisan, commercial, and other items of everyday life. They did not extend into the realms of formal Muslim religious and intellectual life.

PART THREE

We must now turn to the third and final part of the discussion in order to examine the Byzantine legacy under the Turks, more specifically to see how the Turks affected it.

The first and most obvious effect, but also the most important, was the destruction of the theocratic state structure of the Byzantines, Armenians, Bulgars, and Serbs. The local Christian dynasties disappeared in the wars; converted, fled, or sank into the lower ranks of the Christian population. The destruction of the state in a theocratic society is an unqualified disaster for a civilization in which formal cultural norms are determined by the state apparatus. Ibn Khaldun had pondered this law of history and found it to be universally applicable within the broad geographical Islamic realm throughout its long historical experience. With the disappearance of this capstone in the social edifice, the firm muscular tone and sharpness of its formal culture was

¹²³ Meyer, *Türk. Studien* (*supra*, note 45), *passim*. In addition to A. Tietze's articles on Greek loan-words in Turkish, see his "Slavische Lehnwörter in der turkischen Volkssprache," *Oriens*, 10 (1957), 1-47; he has written also a study, as yet unpublished, on Armenian loan-words.

¹²⁴ Critobulus-Grecu, 43.

not only lost to Byzantine society, but this culture atrophied. Ibn Khaldun remarked: "A nation that has been defeated and comes under the rule of another nation will quickly perish."

"The reason for this may possibly lie in the apathy that comes over people when they lose control of their own affairs and, through enslavement, become the instrument of others and dependent upon them."¹²⁵

The original goal of the Turks, as we saw, was to amass the manpower and resources necessary to conquer and hold their vast empire. Thus, in destroying the Christian dynasties and political structures they nevertheless utilized the lower portion of the Christian political and social structure to help secure their enormous holdings. Consequently, a portion of the Byzantine administrative-military apparatus survived on the lower level, but, and this is important for the nature of the later Byzantine legacy, it served a political force which belonged to an alien civilization, Islam. The Christian *spahis*, who constituted the survivors of the decimated Christian military aristocracy (*proto-noiarioi*), were eventually alienated from Byzantine society by the Turkish system through religious conversion. Thus, the partial survival of the Christian military aristocracy immediately following the conquests was only temporary and by the sixteenth century the Christian *spahis* had disappeared and the Turks did not permit them to be replenished by new Christian recruits. Consequently, both the ruling dynasties and the high aristocracies (military and bureaucratic) were extinguished by the Turks, and only the more modest of the secular representatives of Byzantine culture survived.

On the military level these included the chieftains and leaders of the local Christian military bodies; the *martolos*, *voynuks*, *Eflaks*, and *derbentdjis*. Many of these groups survived until the wars of independence in the nineteenth century, but their social and cultural affiliation was with the Christian folk culture rather than with the old and more refined Byzantine formal culture.

As the Turks utilized the local institutions in the towns, especially the *demogeronteia* of the twelve, or the Italian version of it in the isles, and the system of the *kodjabash* as tax instruments, Byzantine traditions survived in the middle and rural classes.¹²⁶ The Turks thus reduced the Byzantine legacy to one which resided primarily in the peasant lower and urban middle classes. There were, of course, two great exceptions: the Phanariot aristocracy and the Church. These were the receptacles of whatever formal Byzantine culture survived within the Ottoman Empire. Zygomalas wrote to Martin Crusius in the sixteenth century that members of the old aristocracy were still around Istanbul, but that they no longer enjoyed the economic and political power of the good old days.¹²⁷ They were involved in the system of Ottoman tax farming with seemingly indifferent economic success. This is borne out by Ottoman documents and other sources of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries which mention, as recipients of *mukataas* or as merchants, Comnenus bin

¹²⁵ Ibn Khaldun, *The Muqaddimah. An Introduction to History*, tr. F. Rosenthal (New York, 1958) (hereafter Ibn Khaldun-Rosenthal), I, 130.

¹²⁶ Vakalopoulos, *op. cit. (supra, note 14)*, II₁, 279-307.

¹²⁷ *Ibid.*, 356.

Palaeologus, Yorgi bin Palaeologus, Manuel Palaeologus, Ducas, Chalcocondyles, Cantacuzene, Mouzalon, Vatatzes, and Rhalles.¹²⁸ But the wealth and power of the Phanariots became important later, and though the leading Phanariot families may not have been genealogically descended from the old Byzantine families they did continue this older aristocratic tradition.¹²⁹

The fate of the Byzantine legal legacy is a particularly complex and confusing one about which we are only now beginning to learn the main outlines. The opposition and accommodation of Reichsrecht and Volksrecht are co-eval with the establishment of the first multisectarian and multinational empires, and their relationship constitutes one of the most intriguing and important chapters in the history of the Roman, Byzantine, and Islamic empires. The complexity of legal relations in the Ottoman Balkans and Anatolia becomes immediately apparent in a mere listing of the various extant living sources of law: Islamic *sharia*, Sultanic legislation, the old law of the Byzantium Empire, of Serbia, Bulgaria, Armenia, of Uzun Hasan, the law of the Orthodox Church, the Syriac Church, the Armenian Church, and of the Jews, the special position of the Italian Levantines, and finally the great number of customary laws.

The Islamic theocratic concept of society established a certain legal pattern which determined the overall relations of these different elements. The basic guide line was the well-known arrangement by which *dhimmis*, as possessors of their own revealed scriptures, were to be judged in all matters involving only the members of their own community by their own judges and according to their own law. Muslims were to have recourse to the *cadis* and the *sharia*. In order to grasp somewhat better what this meant in terms of the fate of Byzantine legal traditions, we must pose two questions: What was the law of the *dhimmis*? What happened to Christian legal practices when Christians were involved with Muslims?

The most important element in the law of the Christians had been Church law and the Byzantine version of Roman law, which had a great influence on the Greeks, Slavs, Armenians, and Syrians.¹³⁰ This law had spread as a result

¹²⁸ Gökbilgin, *Edirne* (as in note 34 *supra*), 89, 93, 106–107, 151–152; Stoianovich, *op. cit.* (*supra*, note 99), 240.

¹²⁹ Iorga, *op. cit.* (*supra*, note 99), 220–241; I. Gottwald, *Phanariotische Studien*, *Leipziger Viertel-jahrschrift für Südosteuropa*, V (1941), 1–58; M. P. Zallony, *Traité sur les princes de la Valachie et de la Moldavie, sortis de Constantinople sous le nom: Fanariotes* (Paris, 1830).

On the marriage alliance between the family of Dionysius Rhalis Palaeologus (sixteenth to seventeenth century) and that of the famous Michael Cantacuzene, see Iorga, “Un conseiller byzantin de Michelle-le-Brave: Le métropolite Denis Rhalis Paléogogue,” *Académie roumaine. Bulletin de la section historique*, I (1920), 102–103. Iorga dates the appearance of strict Byzantine hierachic and synodal forms in Roumania to this time. See also *idem*, “Les grandes familles byzantines et l’idée byzantine en Roumaine,” *ibid.*, XVIII (1931), 3–5, on members of the Vatatzes, Chrysolorus, Azanaius, and Chalcocondyles families trading in Russia.

¹³⁰ For the law and legal codes prior to the Turkish conquest, see: G. Michalides-Nouaros and G. Simonetos, *Τόμος Ἀρμενοπούλου ἐπὶ τῇ ἔξακοσιτηρίδι τῆς Ἐξαβίθλου αὐτοῦ (1345–1945)*, (Thessaloniki, 1952) (hereafter *Τόμος*); A. V. Soloviev, “Der Einfluss des byzantinischen Rechts auf die Völker Osteuropas,” *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte*, LXXVI (Romanistische Abteilung) (1959), 432–479; Jireček, “Das Gesetzbuch des serbischen Caren Stephan Dušan,” *Archiv für slavische Philologie*, 22 (1900), 144–214; N. Radojčić, “Dushanov zakonik i vizantisko pravo,” *Zbornik u čast sheste stogodishnjice zakonika Tsara Dushana*, I (Belgrade, 1951), 45–77; A. Christo-

of the fact that the State and Church had applied it. So long as a centralized Christian State and Church directed society they supported this Byzantine law, or a law strongly affected by it, which in turn supported the established authority of the State. But customary law of the various peoples and even of various localities had existed side by side with Byzantine law, and was often in conflict with it. With the Turkish conquests and the collapse of these Christian states, the Byzantine and Byzantino-Slavic codes no longer enjoyed the official support of a Christian State (the Roumanian Principalities were an exception), and conditions were created which would allow a vigorous reassertion of various customary laws. This customary law, however, would already have interacted with Byzantine law for a considerable time so that one can assume that it was not completely foreign to it. And the Church, which did survive these Christian states, possessed a legal system which was strongly Byzantine. Consequently the law or laws of the *dhimmis* probably represented a mixed system of customary law, partially Byzantinized in the pre-Turkish period, and of ecclesiastical law which was Byzantine. The re-unification of the Orthodox churches after 1454 under the patriarch of Constantinople would strengthen this Byzantine ecclesiastical law in the life of the Balkan Christians. It is significant that the text of Armenopoulos enjoyed a considerable history in the Balkans until modern times.¹³¹

What happened to Christian legal practices when they confronted or were in conflict with Ottoman legal institutions? Obviously where there was open conflict the Turkish law prevailed, especially when Christians were involved in litigation with Muslims. The basis of this was the inacceptability of Christian testimony in the *cadi*'s court. The invalidity of *dhimmi* testimony was considered such a self-evident truth that Turkish jurists felt no need to justify it in their legal treatises. The greatest of the Ottoman *muftis*, Ebu Su'ud, formulated this as follows: "The testimony of an infidel against a Muslim is not acceptable unless it occurs in one of the following cases: in matters of wills, degree of relationship, or if an heir reclaims from an opponent a right accruing to him from a deceased."¹³²

philopoulos, "Η δικαιοδοσία τῶν ἐκκλησιστικῶν δικαστηρίων ἐπὶ ιδιωτικῶν διαφορῶν κατὰ τὴν βυζαντινὴν περίοδον," *Ἐπετηρίς Εταιρείας Βυζαντινῶν Σπουδῶν*, XVIII (1948), 192–201.

¹³¹ Pantazopoulos, *op. cit. (supra)*, note 108), *passim*; S. Bobčev, "Coup d'oeil sur le régime juridique des Balkans sous le régime ottoman," *Revue internationale des études balkaniques*, I (1935), 185–194 (523–532); *idem*, "Quelques remarques sur le droit coutumier bulgare pendant l'époque de la domination ottomane," *ibid.*, I (1934), 34–35; H. Kaleshi, "Türkische Angaben über den Kanun des Leka Dukadjini," in *Südosteuropa Schriften*, 6 (1964), 103–112; I. Vizvizes, "Τὸ πρόβλημα τῆς ιστορίας τοῦ μεταβυζαντινοῦ δικαίου," *Ἐπετηρίς ἀρχείου ιστορίας Ἑλληνικοῦ δικαίου τῆς Ἀκαδημίας Ἀθηνῶν*, VI (1955), 131 ff.; Pantazopoulos, "Community Laws and Customs of Western Macedonia under Ottoman Rule," *Balkan Studies*, 2 (1961), 1–22; I. Lykoures, "Η διοικησις καὶ δικαιοσύνη τῶν τουρκοκρατημένων νήσων. Αίγινα, Πόρος, Σπέτσαι, Υδρα κτλ. (Thessaloniki, 1954); D. Gines, "Περίγραμμα ιστορίας τοῦ μεταβυζαντινοῦ δικαίου," *Ἐπετηρίς Εταιρείας Βυζαντινῶν Σπουδῶν*, XXVIII (1958), 258 ff.; *idem*, "Περὶ τὴν μετάφρασιν τῆς Ἐξοθίβλου ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἀλεξίου Σπανοῦ," *Τόμος*, 173 ff.

¹³² M. Grignaschi, "La valeur du témoignage des sujets non-musulmans (*dhimmi*) dans l'empire ottoman," *La preuve*, pt. 3, *Civilisations archaïques, asiatiques et islamiques*, Recueils de la Société Jean Bodin, XVIII (1963), 242–243, 223, 231–233, 236. Ebu Su'ud remarked that Christian testimony was never to be trusted, for, inasmuch as the Christians suffered oppression they would be ill disposed toward Muslims.

Christian testimony in all other matters, in a court of the *cadi*, is completely valueless. A second *fetva* states this principle much more dramatically: "A village is inhabited exclusively by infidels and no Muslim lives there. If in [such a village] the Muslim Zeyid kills the *dhimmi* Amer, is the deposition of the population of that village against Zeyid receivable?" Answer: "No, if Zeyid is a Muslim." (Ebu Su'ud)¹³³

A further insight into this complex but weighty issue is afforded by the *fetva* of Yahya Dhakaryazade who declares the following. If a *dhimmi*, in the presence of other *dhimmis*, buys an item, refuses to pay, and then turns Muslim, he cannot be convicted in the *cadi*'s court on the basis of *dhimmi* testimony.¹³⁴

Turkish law not only reduced the jurisdiction of the Christian law courts in certain areas of Christian life, but markedly affected certain Christian institutions, especially marriage, divorce, and inheritance.¹³⁵ The Turkish law gave legal recognition to a form of marriage known as *kabin*; this was a marriage between an Ottoman male and Christian female in which the former made a matrimonial gift to the woman for the period of cohabitation in return for the lease of the "field of the woman." Both the children born of the union and the woman herself received the protection of Turkish law and the children were thus legitimate. After the contracted period had elapsed the woman was legally free to leave. This form of marriage between Muslim and Christian became extremely widespread, much to the discomfort of the Church. Numerous Christian women, whose parents could not secure the money for her dowry and *trachoma*, found this a solution to the marital problem. On the other hand, there is evidence that Turkish men used the *kabin* for violent seizure of and marriage with Christian women.

This type of temporary marriage soon came to be employed by large numbers of Christians who appeared before the *cadis* for the ceremony, thereby enjoying the protection of Turkish law against their own Church law and also obtaining legal recognition of the legitimacy of their children. Thus, these Turkish laws on marriage had considerable effect on the marriage customs of the Christians, probably contributing to the substantial increase in concubinage which was also legally recognized by Turkish law. Christians frequently secured divorces from the *cadis* and the Church was forced to acknowledge these formally.

The single most important survival of Byzantine formal institutional life was the Church. The very traditions of Islamic doctrine and statecraft provided the legal basis for its survival, and this was further enhanced by the anti-Latin

¹³³ *Ibid.*, 258–259.

¹³⁴ *Ibid.*, 230–231, 256–259. For additional details, see Gökbilgin, "La preuve et le témoignage dans la jurisprudence des 'fetva' d'Ebüss'ud et quelques exemples d'application dans les tribunaux ottomans du XVI^e siècle," *ibid.*, 205–209.

¹³⁵ Pantazopoulos, *op. cit.* (*supra*, note 108), *passim*; Gines, "'Ανέκδοτον ἐγχειρίδιον περὶ τῆς ἔξ ἀδιαθέτου κληρονομικῆς διαδοχῆς κατὰ τὸ 'Οθωμανικὸν δίκαιον,'" "Επετηρίς Εταιρείας Βυζαντινῶν Σπουδῶν, XXVII (1957), 272–291; P. Zepos, "Παλληκαριάτικον ἢ ἀγριαλίκιον," *Πελοποννησιακά*, V (1962), 322–347.

predisposition of many of the Orthodox and the administrative requirements of an empire which had a very high proportion of Christian subjects.¹³⁶ Whether the report of the *Chronicon Majus* on the *pronomia* accorded by Mehmed II to the patriarch is authentic or not, there is a similar tradition relating to the eleventh-century Sultan Melik Shah by which he gave such privileges to the heads of the Greek, Georgian, and Armenian churches.¹³⁷ According to the theory of many scholars, the Church, its possessions, and its privileges were all honored by the Turks, and the Christians preferred the Turks to the Latins, perhaps even to their own rulers. There can be no doubt that the survival of Orthodox Christians is in large part due to the official policies of Mehmed II in 1454, for, without the survival of the patriarchate and its ecclesiastical hierarchy Orthodox Christian civilization would have disappeared through conversion and through the dilution of popular Byzantine religious culture and its gradual sublimation into popular Islam. This is evident in the fate of Christianity under the Turks prior to 1454 and also in its many vicissitudes afterward. The survival of the patriarchate demonstrates how important institutions are in cultural continuity, not only because of their preservation of cultural content, but, more importantly, because they provide visible symbols with which the members of the society can easily identify and thus maintain the forms themselves even without understanding their content.

It is extremely significant for the Church that the Turks incorporated the formal ecclesiastical administration only after the capture of the capital of the Empire and the destruction of the latter. Consequently, prior to 1454 ecclesiastical conditions were (with rare exceptions) never uniformly regulated. Patriarch and Church were inseparable adjuncts of the Christian Empire, the foe par-excellence of the Turkish Islamic State. In estimating the effect of the Seljuks and Ottomans on the Church, we must once more recall the nature and periods of the conquest. In Asia Minor the Church experienced three distinct eras of Turkish rule between the eleventh and fifteenth centuries. In the first (late eleventh to mid-twelfth century) and third (late thirteenth to fifteenth century) the Turkish conquests and invasions resulted in the destruction of the Church as a social and religious institution. The Turks took the Church properties and revenues, destroyed or confiscated the Church buildings, and drove out the bishops or hindered them from entering their dioceses for extensive periods of time. The churches, impoverished and deprived of leadership, collapsed and the Christians were absorbed by religious conversion. Pre-

¹³⁶ Vakalopoulos, *op. cit.* (*supra*, note 14), II, 134–219; T. H. Papadopoulos, *Studies and Documents Relating to the History of the Greek Church and People under Turkish Domination* (Brussels, 1952); G. Hering “Das islamische Recht und die Investitur des Genadios Scholarios (1454),” *Balkan Studies*, 2 (1961), 231–256; F. Giese, “Die geschichtlichen Grundlagen für die Stellung der christlichen Untertanen im osmanischen Recht,” *Der Islam*, 19 (1931), 264–277; J. H. Mordtmann, “Die Kapitulation von Konstantinopel im Jahre 1453,” *BZ*, 21 (1912), 129–144; M. Gedeon, ‘Επίσημα γράμματα τουρκικά ἀναφερόμενα εἰς τὰ ἔκκλησιαστικά ἡμῶν δίκαια (Constantinople, 1910).

¹³⁷ Antoniades-Bibicou, “Un aspet des relations byzantino-turques en 1073–1074,” *Actes du XII^e congrès international d'études byzantines* (Belgrade, 1964), II, 15–25; Matthew of Edessa (as in note 29 *supra*), 201; Brosset, *Géorgie*, I, 348–349.

cisely this pattern is discernible in Thrace between 1354 and 1464.¹³⁸ Consequently, by the time Mehmed II unified the Balkans and Anatolia and stabilized conditions, the Church had suffered an unparalleled disaster from the Turkish invasions, particularly in Asia Minor but to a lesser degree in the Balkans. In spite of the more favorable position of the Church after 1454 the church continued to suffer from its own defects (primarily simony), Turkish fiscal policy, and occasional outbreaks of Muslim fanaticism. These resulted in general confiscation of property (only one of the original Byzantine churches remains in the hands of the Greeks of Constantinople) and conversions. Though the stabilization of 1454 saved the Church and regulated its life, the very nature of Islamic society made it impossible for the patriarchate to regain the hosts of lost Christians and properties: The principle "once Muslim always Muslim" was rigidly observed, and reversion to Christianity from Islam was punishable by death.

Thus, the effect of the Turkish forms on this the most important Byzantine legacy was fatal in Anatolia but less serious in the Balkans. There it continued to radiate a type of Byzantine culture through its religious preaching, the old law which it applied in the episcopal courts, its patronage of Byzantine art—especially painting—and religious literature.¹³⁹ But of course all this proceeded on a modest scale, as the economic resources formerly available were now gone. It manifested considerable vigor on the folk level where the itinerant monks went about the countryside preaching to the Christians and founding monasteries and religious schools.¹⁴⁰ These manifestations of popular Christianity were parallel to the activities of the Muslim dervishes who also had a powerful influence on the Muslim masses.

The most serious effect of the Turkish conquest on the Church was in the realm of religious conversion. This question has usually been discussed within the theoretical framework of Islamic law, according to which *dhimmis* are not to be forcibly converted. This has been coupled with an argument from historical example, that in the early Arab conquests the Arabs did not desire the conversion of Christians as it would have meant the loss of revenues. Similarly,

¹³⁸ The synodal decisions, edited by F. Miklosich and I. Müller, in *Acta et diplomata graeca medii aevi sacra et profana* (Vienna, 1860–62), I–II, are emphatic and decisive on these points. Balsamon's commentaries reveal the same conditions in eleventh- and twelfth-century Anatolia. See also A. H. Wächter, *Der Verfall des Griechentums in Kleinasiens in XIV Jahrhundert* (Leipzig, 1903); K. I. Amantos, "Zu den Bischofslisten als historischen Quellen," *Akten des XI. internationalen Byzantinistenkongresses, München 1958* (Munich, 1960), 21–23; Ostrogorsky, "La prise de Serrès par les Turcs," *Byzantion*, XXXV (1965), 309–310.

¹³⁹ K. Kourkoulas, 'Η θεωρία τοῦ κηρύγματος κατά τοὺς χρόνους τῆς τουρκοκρατίας (Athens, 1957); A. Tachiaos, 'Ο Πατριός Βελιτσάρφσκι καὶ ἡ ἀσκητικοφιλολογικὴ σχολή του (Thessaloniki, 1964); A. Xyngopoulos, Σχεδιασματικὸς ιστορίας τῆς θρησκευτικῆς ζωγραφικῆς μετά τὴν Ἀλωσιν (Athens, 1957); M. Chatzidakis, "Contribution à l'étude de la peinture post Byzantine," in *Le cinq-centième anniversaire de la prise de Constantinople* (Athens, 1953), 193–216; Papadopoulos-Kerameus, *Denys de Phourna, manuel d'iconographie chrétienne accompagné de ses sources principales inédites et publiées avec préface, pour la première fois en entier d'après son texte original* (St. Petersburg, 1909); V. Grecu, "Byzantinische Handbücher der Kirchenmalerei," *Byzantion*, IX (1934), 675–701.

¹⁴⁰ Ph. Michalopoulos, *Κοσμᾶς ὁ Αἰτωλός* (Athens, 1940); Deliales, "Ἡ διαθήκη τοῦ δούλου Νικάνορος τοῦ Θεσσαλονικέως," *Μακεδονικά*, IV (1960), 416–425; K. Mertzios, "Ἡ Οσία Φιλοθέη. Ἀνέκδοτα ἔγγραφα," *Ἐλληνικά*, XIII (1954), 122–128.

according to legal and historical considerations, the Turks were not interested in the conversion of their Christian subjects to Islam and did not urge their conversion, or so the theory runs. However, the historical circumstances of the Turkish conquests differed considerably from those of the Arab expansion. The tradition of *jihad*, or religious war, had enjoyed a long and ferocious history by the time the Turks settled in Anatolia, and further there had arisen new religious orders: the dervishes, who were strongly imbued with proselytizing zeal. Consequently, though the Turkish sultans officially recognized the position of Christianity, many of their followers did not; in addition, numerous Byzantine regions were conquered by the sword, rather than by treaty, which made the immediate position of the Christians in those regions quite different. Conversion was most widespread in those areas which were subject most frequently to warfare, upheaval, and social disruption; that is to say, in much of Asia Minor (save the regions of northeast Anatolia). The conversionary process was constantly operative in Anatolia, as we see in the pages of Balsamon, Eflaki, Aşıqپashazade, and Zygomalas.¹⁴¹

The Balkans, subdued more quickly, integrated immediately into a centralized state and reunited with the patriarchate in Constantinople which was now officially recognized, remained predominantly Christian, though there were extensive group and individual conversions during the long centuries of Ottoman rule. Within each social group, whether of Christian *spahis*, guildsmen, sailors, farmers, or slaves, we see the relentless process of Islamization. By the sixteenth century the Christian *spahis* largely disappeared; within the intersectarian guilds there was a struggle between Muslims and Christians for control and we find converts elected to the headship of guilds; the Greek naval contingents at Gallipoli had converted by the sixteenth century, etc.¹⁴² Conversions were numerous during and immediately after the Balkan conquests, a phenomenon which especially disturbed Gennadius Scholarius. Particularly revealing is the Menaqib of Bedr ed-Din from Simavna, the dervish whose soldier-father married the daughter of the Greek governor of a Thracian fort. All the Christian relatives of Bedr ed-Din's mother then apostasized and served their conqueror and new relative.¹⁴³ Conversions continued slowly and systematically thereafter, gaining considerable momentum during periods of Turkish military defeats and during campaigns against Christian powers. In

¹⁴¹ Rhalles and Potles (as in note 104 *supra*), III, 27–28: καὶ ἄλλοι πολλοὶ κατὰ βίαν περιτμηθέντες παρὰ Ἀγαρηνῶν, καὶ ἄλλα τινὰ πεποιηκότες ἢ καὶ παθόντες ἀσεβῆ..., 247, ἄλλα καὶ σήμερον πολλοὶ ταῖς τῶν ἀδέων Ἀγαρηνῶν χεροῖν ἀλώξιμοι γινόνεμοι, καὶ βασανιζόμενοι, πὴ μέν, τὴν ὁρθόδοξον πίστιν ἔξόμυνυνται, πὴ δέ, τὴν ἀθεον θρησκείαν τοῦ Μωάμεθ διόμυννται: ἄλλοι δὲ καὶ ἐκοντὶ ἑαυτούς ἐπιβίπτουσιν εἰς τὸν ἀπιστίας βόθρον; Eflaki-Huart (as in note 83 *supra*), I, 111–112, 190, 206, 244–247, 325, 333, 365, II, 2–3, 13–14, 69–70, 96–97, 410; F. Giese, *Die altosmanischen anonymen Chroniken* (Breslau, 1922), II, 18–19, 23; Miklosich and Müller (as in note 138 *supra*), I, 69, 103, 143, 183–184; II, 491; Gökbilgin, "XVI. yüzyıl başlarında Trabzon livası ve doğu Karadeniz bölgesi," *Belleten*, Türk Tarih Kurumu, XXVI, 102 (1962), 321–324, 331–332; Vakalopoulos, *op. cit.* (*supra*, note 14), II₁, 44–49.

¹⁴² Inalcık, "Gelibolu," *EI*₂; *idem*, "Duşan'dan," *passim*; Mantran, *op. cit.*, 374; Galabov-Duda, *op. cit.* (*supra*, note 94), 40.

¹⁴³ Vakalopoulos, *op. cit.* (*supra*, note 14), II₁, 44–45; Kissling, "Das Menäqybnâme Scheich Bedr ed-Din's des Sohnes des Richters von Samâvnâ," *Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, C (1950), 114–116, 140–164.

Bulgaria substantial numbers of Christians were converted in the Rhodope regions during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.¹⁴⁴ Perhaps the most significant conversions occurred in Bosnia, Herzegovina,¹⁴⁵ and Albania,¹⁴⁶ although they were consequential in Crete and Macedonia¹⁴⁷ as well. This conversionary pressure and the insecurity of Christian life produced widespread crypto-Christianity in the regions of Trebizond, Nicaea, central Anatolia, Crete, Cyprus, and resulted, too, in the crypto-Judaism of the *dömmé*'s.¹⁴⁸ Conversion proceeded from a variety of causes: the desire to escape the serious disabilities of *dhimmis* and to enjoy the status of the favored class,¹⁴⁹ the religious persuasion and syncretism of the missionary dervishes;¹⁵⁰ finally, there were forced conversions and neo-martyrs, and these seem to have been somewhat more widespread than has hitherto been thought.¹⁵¹ Islam enjoyed

¹⁴⁴ P. Petrov, *Asimilatoriškata politika na turskite zavoevateeli. Sbornik ot dokumenti za pomokhamedanvaniia i poturčchaniia (XV–XIX v)* (Sofia, 1964), 48–106, and *passim*. S. N. Šiškov, *Bulgaromohamedanite (Pomatsi). Istoriko-zemepisenu i narodoucheniu pregledu s obrazi* (Plovdiv, 1936); C. Vakarelski, "Altertümliche Elemente in Lebensweise und Kultur der bulgarischen Mohammedaner," *Zeitschrift für Balkanologie*, IV (1966), 149–172; Cvetkova, "O religiozno-natsionalnoi diskriminatsii v Bulgarii vo vremia turetskovo vladychestva," *Sovetskoe vostokovedenie* (1957), No. 2. Galabov-Duda, *op. cit.* (*supra*, note 94), *passim*, where converts are reported involved in 284 cases appearing before the *cadi* court of Sofia.

¹⁴⁵ B. Djurdjević, "Bosna," *EI*, 2; M. Handžić, *Islamizacija Bosni i Hercegovini i posjetlo bosanskohercegovačkih Muslimana* (1940).

¹⁴⁶ S. Skendi, "Religion in Albania during the Ottoman Rule," *Südost-Forschungen*, XV (1956), 311–327; Hasluck, *op. cit.* (*supra*, note 110), I, 155, II, 474.

¹⁴⁷ P. Hidiroglou, *Das religiöse Leben auf Kreta nach Ewlija Čelebi* (Bonn, 1967), 31–92; Vakalopoulos, *op. cit.* (*supra*, note 14), II, 44–49; Vasdravelles, 'Αρχεία (as in note 102 *supra*), A', 182–184, 237–238, 260–262, 302–303, 323, 341–345, 349–351, 355–356, 381–385, 389–390, 414–415, 421–423, 430–431, 436, 447, 453, 465, 473, 479–480, 497, 500, 505, 507, 509, 524–529, 541–559, 567; also, *ibid.*, B', *passim*; Hasluck, *op. cit.* (*supra*, note 110), I, 8, II, 526–528, 474; I. Martinianos, 'Η Μοσχόπολις 1330–1930 (Thessaloniki, 1957), 19; Vakalopoulos, *op. cit.* (*supra*, note 14), III, 531, on Cretan converts, the so-called Burmades (burmak-twist); I. Kondylakis, "Οι ξεκουκούλωτοι," 'Εβδομάς, IV (1887), no. 36, 12; T. Papadopoulos, "Πρόσφατοι έξισλαμισμοὶ ἀγροτικού πληθυσμοῦ ἐν Κύπρῳ," *Κυπριακαὶ Σπουδαὶ XXIX* (1965), 27–48; I. Voyatzides, "Έκτουρκισμός καὶ έξισλαμισμός τῶν 'Ελλήνων," in 'Ιστορικαὶ Μελέται' (Thessaloniki, 1933), 3–60.

¹⁴⁸ Dawkins, "The Crypto-Christians of Turkey," *Byzantium*, VIII (1933), 247–275; R. Janin, "Musulmans malgré eux: les Stavriotes," *Echos d'Orient*, XV (1912), 495–504. Miklosich and Müller (as in note 138 *supra*), I, 183–184, 197–198; Hasluck, "The Crypto-Christians of Trebizond," *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, XLI (1921), 199–202; Gordlevsky, *op. cit.* (*supra*, note 11), III, 37–44; A. D. Mordtmann, *Skizzen und Reisebriefe aus Kleinasien (1850–1859)*, ed. F. Babinger (Hannover, 1925), *passim*. M. Defner, "Πέντε έβδομάδες παρὰ τοῖς ἀρνητούρησκοις ἐν 'Οφει,'" 'Εστία, no. 87 (1877), 547ff.; S. Antonopoulos, *Μικρὰ Ασία* (Athens, 1907), 57–72; M. Perlmann, "Dönme," *EI*, 2.

¹⁴⁹ Manuel Palaeologus in Lampros, *Παλαιολόγεια καὶ Πελοποννησιακά* (Athens, 1926), III, 46–49. See also the interesting remarks of Ricoldo-Cydones, PG, 154, col. 1105, and John Cantacuzene, PG, 154, col. 552.

¹⁵⁰ The role of the dervishes was decisive, for which one must consult the numerous studies of Kissling; also Gordlevsky, *op. cit.* (*supra*, note 11), I, 197–214, 219–225; A. Görpinarlı, *Mevlana'dan sonra Mevlevilik* (Istanbul, 1953); J. Birge, *The Bektashi Order of Dervishes* (London, 1937); Barkan, "Osmanlı imparatorluğunda bir iskân ve kolonizasyon metodу olarak vakıflar ve temlikler. I. İstilâ devirlerinin kolonizatör türk dervişleri ve zâviyeleri," *Vakıflar Dergisi*, II (1942), 279–386.

¹⁵¹ Nicodemus Agiorites, *Néon Μαρτυρολόγιον*, ἡτοι μαρτύρια τῶν νεοφανῶν μαρτύρων τῶν μετὰ τὴν ἀλωσιν τῆς Κωνσταντινουπόλεως κατὰ διαφόρους καιρούς καὶ τόπους μαρτυρησάντων, 3rd ed. (Athens, 1961); L. Arnaud, "Néo-martyres orthodoxes: Michel d'Athènes et Angelus d'Argos," *EchOr*, XVI (1913), 396–408, 517–525; *idem*, "Les quatres néo-martyres d'Agrinion," *ibid.*, XIV (1911), 288–292; H. Delehaye, "Le martyre de Saint Nicétas le Jeune," *Mélanges offerts à M. Gustave Schlumberger* (Paris, 1924), I, 205–211; *idem*, "Greek Neo-Martyrs," *The Constructive Quarterly*, IX (1921), 701–712; Papadopoulos-Kerameus, "Συμβολai εἰς τὴν ιστορίαν Τραπεζούντος. I. Θεόδωρος Γαβρᾶς," *VizVrem*, XII (1906), 132–137; P. Karlin-Hayter, "La politique religieuse des conquérants ottomans dans un texte hagiographique (c. 1437)," *Byzantium*, XXXV (1965), 353–358.

many advantages in this unequal struggle with Christianity; the prestige of association with a militarily victorious and politically dominant class, great economic affluence,¹⁵² and the law which punished apostasy from Islam by death. Ibn Khaldun had made this keen observation: "The widely accepted reason for changes in institutions and customs is the fact that the customs of each race depend on the customs of its ruler. As the proverb says: 'The common people follow the religion of the ruler.'"¹⁵³

Cuius regio eius religio. This summarizes succinctly what transpired in Persia, Syria, Egypt, North Africa, Spain, Sicily, and Crete when the political fortunes of either Christianity or Islam waned and were replaced by the good fortunes of its opponent.

The Turkish conquest caused a profound alteration in the Byzantine demographic and ethnographic configurations by virtue, first, of the settlement of substantial numbers of Turks. But the alteration was not due to those settlements alone, for these invasions resulted in widespread displacement, conversions, and transplanting of populations. In Anatolia there is a very marked movement of Christian populations from the central plateau, from the eleventh to the twelfth century, toward the Christian held coastal regions and to the protection of the mountains and forests.¹⁵⁴ In the late thirteenth and fourteenth centuries there is a further flight of Christian populations from western Anatolia to the Aegean isles and Thrace, from Cilicia to the fortified isles off the coast, and from the rural areas into the towns.¹⁵⁵ Throughout this long period the continual enslavements, massacres, the famine and plague attendant upon the sieges of towns and disruption of agriculture, as well as conversions, led to a profound diminution of the Christian population. In the Balkans there was a similar flight to the mountains of the settled populations before the Turkish advance, particularly in Thrace, and along the principal routes of Macedonia and Bulgaria. But the displacements and death toll were not as extensive as in Anatolia.

In the wake of the conquest groups of Turks, Tatars, and Mongols settled along the whole length and breadth of the two peninsulas. In Anatolia the nomads were most compactly settled on the border regions of western Asia Minor from Eskişehir to the district of Antalya (the famous Udj), in the north

¹⁵² The lands of the Christian church suffered drastic confiscations; being given to Islamic religious and administrative institutions. On the Christian side this profound impoverishment is reflected in the ecclesiastical institution of grants κατά λόγου ἐπιδόσεως, Miklosich and Müller (as in note 138 *supra*), I-II, *passim*. On the Islamic side the affluence of Turkish religious institutions can be seen in the development of the *evqaf*. For examples of Christian properties which were converted to *evqaf* and *timar*, see the two works of Gökbilgin, *Edirne* (as in note 34 *supra*), and "Trabzon" (as in note 141 *supra*). The history of these two institutions, κατά λόγου ἐπιδόσεως and *evqaf*, is the best and surest index of the economic misfortunes of Christianity and of the prosperity of Islam.

¹⁵³ Ibn Khaldun-Rosenthal (as in note 125 *supra*), I, 58.

¹⁵⁴ Attaliates, 211, 267–268; Miklosich and Müller (as in note 138 *supra*), IV, 62, 84, 87, 88; Anna Comnena (as in note 17 *supra*), III, 29, 142, 201, 203; Zonaras, III, 757; Michael the Syrian (as in note 21 *supra*), III, 72; Melikoff, *Danişmend* (as in note 30 *supra*), II, 178; Matthew of Edessa (as in note 29 *supra*), 182.

¹⁵⁵ Pachymeres, I, 310–311, II, 232, 314, 318–319, 335, 402, 438; E. Zachariadou, "Συμβολή στὴν ἱστορία τοῦ νοτιοανατολικοῦ Αιγαίου (μὲ δόρυμη τὰ πατριαρκά φιρμάνια τῶν ἐτῶν 1454–1522)," *Σύμμεικτα, Βασιλικὸν Ἰδρυμα Ἐρευνῶν*, I (1966), 192–193; Canard, "Cilicia," *EI*, 2.

on the Trapezantine borders, on the Taurus borders of Cilician Armenia, and also in eastern Anatolia. In the thirteenth century the entrance of new tribal groups swelled this mass. Thus, when substantial areas became settled by the nomads, the Turkish language spread farther afield (as is indicated by the Turkification of Anatolian rural toponymy).¹⁵⁶ Smaller numbers of the immigrants represented sedentary Turks, Arabs, and Persians. But the urban populace of Anatolia, as well as a substantial sedentary village element, represented the old Christian Byzantine populace. Throughout the twelfth century and the beginnings of the thirteenth the Christians probably outnumbered the Turks. But by the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries the Muslim population of Asia Minor represented approximately 92 per cent and the Christians only about 8 per cent of the total.¹⁵⁷

In the Balkans the demographic movements are a little clearer, since they occurred later. The Turks began to bring in settlers, both nomad and sedentary, soon after they established a foothold in Gallipoli. Murad I and Bayazid I brought in Turkish colonists, especially nomads, and established them along the key routes and in the major centers of Thrace, Madeconia, Thessaly, and Bulgaria.¹⁵⁸ Henceforth Adrianople, Philopolis, Sofia, Thessaloniki, Tirhala, Larissa, and Skopia became major centers of Turkish control and administration, and the Christians gradually, but not completely, withdrew to the mountains. The sixteenth-century tax registers record the following number of taxable hearths in the Balkans. 194,958 Muslim, 832,707 Christian, 4,134 Jewish. The Muslim population represents less than 20 per cent of the total and the Christians more than 80 per cent. Of the 194,958 Muslim hearths, 37,435 are those of Yürüks, or nomads, slightly less than 20 per cent of the Muslim Balkan population.¹⁵⁹ What were the origins of the Balkan Muslim population at this point? Though the Turks transplanted sedentary Muslim elements when they conquered the Balkans, it is highly probable that the most substantial number of Turks consisted of tribal groups whom the sultans resettled as such and organized into military *odjaks*. The three largest of these were the Naldöken, Tanrıdağı, and Selaniki, followed by the lesser Ofchabolu, Vize, and Kodjadzik.¹⁶⁰ There were also smaller groups of Tatars. These

¹⁵⁶ Turan, *Selçuklular* (as in note 11 *supra*), 215.

¹⁵⁷ Barkan, "Essai," (as in note 13 *supra*), 20. There were 1,067,355 Muslim and 78,783 Christian taxable hearths. Read the lament of the fifteenth-century ecclesiastic in Gelzer, *Ungedruckte und ungenugend veröffentlichte Texte der Notitiae Episcopatum. Ein Beitrag zur byzantinischen Kirchen- und Verwaltungsgeschichte*. Abhandlungen der philos.-philolog. Classe der könig. bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, XXI (1901), Abt. III, 630-631.

¹⁵⁸ Chaclocondyles, 60, 99-101, 177, 218; M. Aktepe, "XIV ve XV asırlarda Rumeli'nin türkler tarafından iskânına dair," *Türkiyat Mecmuası*, X (1953), 299-312; Vakalopoulos, "La retraite des populations grecques vers des régions éloignées et montagneuses pendant la domination turque," *Balkan Studies*, 4 (1963), 265-276; N. Todorov, "Za demografskoto sustoianie na balkanskiia poluostriv prez XV-XVI v," *Godishnik na Sof. Univ. Fil.-Ist. Fakul.*, LIII, 2 (1960), 193-226.

¹⁵⁹ Barkan, "Essai" (as in note 13 *supra*), 31-36.

¹⁶⁰ Gökbilgin, *Rumeli'de Yürükler, Tatarlar ve Evlad -i Fâtihân* (İstanbul, 1957). They included the following *odjaks*:

Naldöken	(1603)	243
Tanrıdağı	(1591)	428
Selanik	(1543)	500
Ofchabolu	(1566)	97

The number of an *odjak* varied from 24 to 25 to 30 (Gökbilgin, 30). This number must then be multiplied by 4 or 5 to get the total approximate population in each Yürük group.

Yürüks and Tatars steadily retained their tribal organization and *odjak* numbers throughout the sixteenth century and it was not until the seventeenth century that these dissolved as the nomads began to undergo sedentarization. Inasmuch as the large scale sedentarization of these Balkan nomads occurred only in the seventeenth century, we must assume that of the remaining 157,523 sedentary Muslim hearths in the early sixteenth century a substantial portion represents converted Christian populations.

By the late sixteenth century the Ottoman tax registers indicate a dramatic rise in population and eventually the Christians begin to leave the overpopulated mountain villages and to descend once more into the plains and towns. The Turkish invasions had nevertheless radically altered the Byzantine demographic and ethnic legacy by the imposition of substantial new Turkish elements, conversions, displacement and transplanting, and by the privations suffered by the native populations.

The destruction of the Christian states disengaged the development of the Christian folk cultures from the evolution and leadership of the old Byzantine formal culture, though it is true that the Church served as a partial replacement of the old Christian State in this respect. The removal of the Christian state gave a new impetus to a more vigorous development of folk culture, as we have already seen in the reassertion of customary law at the expense of Byzantine Church law. The expansion of the *zadruga* or *kuča*, the flourishing of the local crafts, folk epic and music, and their military counterparts, the *martolos* and *voynuks*, are all manifestations of a lively development of folk culture. Turkish rule, in providing conditions for this particular development of folk culture, lent it a double character. On the one hand the conditions of Turkish rule produced the *raya* mentality. As second class citizens who were powerless before their Turkish rulers, the Christian peasants and town dwellers developed those qualities of mind and spirit which were demanded by the situation: From fear arose slyness, flattery, accommodation, and a certain sublimation of energies into economic endeavor. But simultaneously the flight to the mountains, a reversion to the *zadruga* polity, the existence of the *martolos* and *voynuk* bands and their intimate association with banditry, produced the second characteristic of the Christian society under Turkish rule: the *humanitas heroica* which is so vividly documented by the popular songs and poetry of the Balkan peoples. This was not the romantic creation of Balkan nationalist scholars writing after the Balkan revolutions; rather, it was this epic society

Vize	(1557)	106
Kodjadjik	(1584)	179
TATARS	(1543)	
Aktav		21
Tırhala		12
Yanbolu		34
Bozapa		21

For their dispersal in the Balkans, see the map in Barkan, "Les déportations comme méthode de peuplement et de colonisation dans l'Empire Ottoman," *Revue de la faculté des sciences économiques de l'Université d'Istanbul*, XI (1949–50), 67–131.

which played such a prominent role in the national revolutions against the Ottomans.

This folk culture not only reacted to these stimuli of Turkish rule in its development, but borrowed, directly, elements from the culture of the conquerors. The most readily identifiable of such popular elements are, of course, the so-called Chinese shadow plays of Karagöz and the figure and exploits of the Turkish Till Eulenspiegel, Nasr ed-Din Hodja. The popularity enjoyed by these two figures among the Balkan peoples grew to the point where they became an integral part of the popular culture of each ethnic group with attributes which were independent of their Turkish origin. Thus, at some point of development of the Greek version of Karagöz, Alexander the Great became a standard character in the repertoire.¹⁶¹ Furthermore, Turkish influence was undoubtedly reflected in music, dance, and cuisine, but here the problem of differentiating the Byzantine from the Turkish is complicated.

A particularly obvious influence on popular culture is found in the effect that Turkish had on the various spoken (not literary) languages of the Christians. In Asia Minor, where Turkish settlers were most numerous, conditions most disturbed, and Turkish rule most enduring, the numbers of Armenian and Greek speakers were most drastically reduced. The retreat of Greek, Armenian, and Persian before Turkish recalls the older linguistic struggle in which the Anatolian languages (Phrygian, Luwian, Isaurian, Gothic, and Celtic) disappeared before the advance of Greek.¹⁶² Even that minority of Anatolian Greeks and Armenians who did not convert to Islam largely succumbed to linguistic Turkification. The region of Trebizond constituted a major exception to this phenomenon and the continuity of the Greek tongue there is to be sought in the history of Trebizond, which remained a compact political and cultural entity from the eleventh to the fifteenth centuries, at the very time when the remainder of Anatolia was conquered, settled, Islamized, and Turkified. When the Turkish conquest came to Trebizond it was quick and the area was soon regularized. The Greek speakers of western Asia Minor represent, basically, Greeks who immigrated relatively late from the isles and elsewhere. The Turkophone Greek Christians of Anatolia with a Christian literature, which, though in Turkish, utilized the Greek alphabet, constitute only one of a host of examples which arose from the cultural changes in the history of the Mediterranean basin. The Arab speaking Syriac Christians and Copts who wrote their Christian literature in Arabic but with their own alphabets, the Mozarabs and Moriscos of Spain, and finally the Greek populations of southern Italy, are all reminiscent of these Karamanlides in Asia Minor. The process of Turkification of these Anatolian Greek Christians was still

¹⁶¹ Gh. Constantin, "'Nasr-ed-Din Khodja' chez les Turcs, les peuples balkaniques et les Roumains," *Der Islam*, 43 (1967), 90–133; H. Ritter, "Karagöz," *EI*; W. Barthold, "Karagöz," *Islam Ansiklopedisi*, 6 (Istanbul, 1955), pp. 246–51.

¹⁶² K. Holl, "Das Fortleben der Volksprachen in Kleinasien in nachchristlicher Zeit," *Hermes*, XLIII (1908), 240–254; Vryonis, "Problems" (as in note 6 *supra*), 115–116; Strabo, XII. 8. 3; XIII. 4. 17; XIV. 2. 28, comments on this earlier process by which Greek began to replace the earlier languages spoken in Anatolia.

visible in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries: and scholars have observed its various stages: The penetration, first, of the Turkish vocabulary, then of its syntactical forms, stages of bilingualism, the recession and final eclipse of Greek.¹⁶³

¹⁶³ The earliest reference to these Turkophone Christians in Asia Minor seems to be the fifteenth-century text which Lampros edited, “Ὑπόμνημα περὶ τῶν Ἑλληνικῶν χωρῶν καὶ ἑκκλησιῶν κατὰ τὸν δέκατον πέμπτον αἰώνα,” Νέος Ἑλληνομνήμων, VII (1910), 366: *notandum est, quod in multis partibus Turcie reperiuntur clerici, episcopi et arciepiscopi, qui portant vestimenta infidelium et locuntur lingua ipsorum et nihil aliud sciunt in greco proferre nisi missam cantare et evangelium et epistolas. Alias autem orationes multi dicunt in lingua Turcorum.* Hans Dernschwam (as in note 73 *supra*), 52, is the first to mention their presence in Istanbul (1553–55): “Nich weit von abstander burg, so Gedicula genant, en einen oeden orth der stadt, wont ein cristen volkh, nent man Caramanos, aus dem landt Caramania, an Persia gelegen, seind cristen, haben den krichischen glauben. Und ire mes haltnen sy auff krikisch und vorstehen doch nicht krikisch. Ir sprach ist turkisch. Nit weiss ich, ab sy anfenglisch turkisch sprach gehapt haben. Das jeczigen turkischen kaysers vatter Selinus sol dis volkh her gen Constantinopol gefurt haben, als er die selbigen lender bekriegt. Scheint ein gros stark volkh sein. Die weyber haben lange, spiczige, weyse und auch von farben huthe auff, also ungerarlich gestallt wie ein baptiskron. Und wan sy ausgelen, so decken sy ein dunn durchsichtzig thuch daruber bis über die bruste.”

For their literature and dialect, see J. Eckmann, “Die karamanische Literatur,” in *Philologiae Turcicae Fundamente*, II (Wiesbaden, 1964), 819–834; *idem*, “Anadolu Karamanlı agızlarına ait araştırmalar I. Phonetika,” *Dil ve tarih-cografya fakültesi dergisi*, VIII (1950), 165–200; *idem*, “Yunan harfleri Karamanlı imlası hakkında,” *Türk dili ve tarihi hakkında araştırmaları*, eds. H. Eren and T. Halasi Kun (Ankara, 1950), I, 27–31; S. Salaville and E. Dalleggio, *Karamanlidika: Bibliographie analytique d'ouvrages en langue turque imprimés en caractères grecs* (Athens, 1958); J. Deny, “Le géronditif en — (y)işin, d’après les écrits du moine Ioanni Hierothéos, en turc des Grecs-orthodoxes turcophones d’Anatolie,” *Körösi Csoma Archivium*, III (1941), 119–128.

The origins of the Karamanlides have long been disputed, there being two basic theories on the subject. According to one, they are the remnants of the Greek speaking Byzantine population which, though it remained Orthodox, was linguistically Turkified. The second theory holds that they were originally Turkish soldiers which the Byzantine emperors had settled in Anatolia in large numbers and who retained their language and Christian religion after the Turkish conquests; see J. Eckmann, “Einige gerundiale Konstruktionen im Karamanischen,” *Jean Deny Armağani* (Ankara, 1958), 77. For bibliography on these theories, see G. Jäschke, “Die Türkische-Orthodoxe Kirche,” *Der Islam*, 39 (1964), 95–129. Cami Baykurt, secretary of the Turkish League for the Defence of Izmir against Greek Claims (after World War I), first proposed the second theory in his *Osmalı ülkesinde Hristiyan Türkler*, 2nd ed. (Istanbul, 1932). Hamdullah Subhi asserted this theory on the basis of the allegedly “purer” character of the Turkish spoken by the Karamanlides, and claims to have discovered many old Turkish words from the Turkophone Orthodox of Antalya in 1923.

Evliya Chelebi came across the Karamanlides in the seventeenth century and made the following interesting comments:

In Antalya the Greek Christians spoke only Turkish. “...and there are four quarters of Greek infidels. But the infidels know essentially no Greek. They speak erroneous Turkish.” (“...ve dördü Urum keferesi mahallesidir Amma keferesi asla urumca bilmezler Batıl Türk lisani üzere kelimat iderler.”, *Seyahatnamesi*, IX, 288.)

In Alaiyya the Greek Christians similarly spoke only Turkish. “There was, from olden times, an infidel Greek quarter. There are altogether 300 (who pay) the *haradj*. They know essentially no Greek but know an erroneous Turkish.” (“Amma kadim eyyamdan beru Urum keferesi bir mahalledir. Cümle üç yüz haradcır Amma asla Urum lisani bilmiyüb batıl Türk lisani bilürler.”, *Seyahatnamesi*, IX, 297.)

To Evliya these Turkophone Christians appeared as Greeks who spoke no Greek but a corrupt Turkish. The sixteenth-century Jacob Miloites also considered the Turkophone Orthodox to be Greeks, Papageorgiou, *op. cit.* (*supra*, note 91), 635, 636: Καὶ εἰς τὴν χώρα τὴν Ἀτάλια ἔστι πολλοὶ χριστιανοὶ Ἐλληνες, ἀλλὰ οὐ γινώσκουσι γλῶσσα Ἐλληνικήν· μόνον τούρκικη γλῶσσα. . . . καὶ εἰς τὰ Σπαρτά πολλοὶ χριστιανοὶ Ἐλληνες· οὐ γινώσκουσι γλῶσσα Ἐλληνική. . . . Ἀπὸ Θύρας εἰς Κοῦλα. Πολλοὶ χριστιανοὶ Ἐλληνες· οὐ γινώσκουν γλῶσσα Ἐλληνική.

More important is the historical consideration that the sources do not indicate any substantial settlement of Turkish troops in Byzantine Asia Minor prior to the Turkish invasions. The more likely explanation of their origins would seem to be that the Karamanlides represent Turkified Byzantine populations, the process of linguistic Turkification still being in evidence in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries; see Dawkins, *op. cit.* (*supra*, note 87), 197–204, and *passim*. The same phenomenon is to be observed among the Armenian populations of Ottoman Anatolia; see *Die Pilgerfahrt des Ritters Arnold von Harff von Cöln durch Italien, Syrien, Aegypten, Arabien, Aethiopien, Nubien, Pa-*

In the Balkans the conquests were shorter, the Turks fewer in number, conversions not as extensive, and linguistic Turkification did not, therefore, proceed on so grand a scale as in Anatolia. Indicative of this failure of massive linguistic Turkification is the fact that many of the converted groups, i.e., Greeks of Crete, Bulgars of the Rhodope, Albanians, and Bosnians, retained their native tongues and were provided with an *aljamiah* literature (written in their native tongues but with the Arab script).¹⁶⁴ The centers of Turkish were Thrace, eastern Bulgaria, Macedonia, the towns and areas all along the main routes of communication and transportation.¹⁶⁵ Nevertheless, the length of Turkish rule, the presence of Turkish administrative, feudal, and commercial classes, and the use of Turkish as the official language by Christians and Turks resulted in the imposition of a new lexicographical *Überschicht* over all the Balkan languages. Turkish loan-words and expressions entered the Balkan tongues by the thousands and remain today as one of the secondary characteristics of the Balkan languages. Often these words represent cultural borrowings, but in many cases they simply reflect the political dominance of the Turks and the use of their language as the official one for administration and commerce.

CONCLUSIONS

This rapid survey of the categories of human society prompts the following observations. Turkish formal society bore essentially Islamic characteristics.

lästina, die Türkei, Frankreich und Spanien, wie er sie in den Jahren 1496 bis 1499 vollendet, ed. E. von Groote (Cologne, 1860), 201: "Item deser Armeniani spraichen gemeynlich sarrascheinische spraich. dan in yeren gotlichen ampten bruyche sy eyne eygen spraiche." The phenomenon is to be observed among the Syriac and Coptic Christians of mediaeval Syria and Egypt, among the Mozarabs and Moriscos of Spain, and among the Greeks of southern Italy.

¹⁶⁴ D. Theodoridis, "Ein unbekanntes griechisch-aljamiadisches Werk aus dem 18. Jh.," *Ier Congrès international des études balkaniques et sud-est européennes. Résumés des communications. Histoire (XVe–XIXe s.)* (Sofia, 1966), 88–91; *idem*, "Ein griechischer aljamiadischer Zweizeiler im Diwan von Ahmed Paşa," *Zeitschrift für Balkanologie*, III (1965), 180–183.

¹⁶⁵ J. Nemeth, *Zur Einteilung der türkischen Mundarten Bulgariens* (Sofia, 1956); *idem*, "Traces of the Turkish Language in Albania," *Acta Orientalia*, XIII (1961), 9–29; G. Hazai, "Beiträge zur Kenntnis der türkischen Mundarten Mazedoniens," *Rocznik orientalistyczny*, XXIII₂ (1960), 83–100; *idem*, "Les dialects turcs du Rhodope," *ActaO*, IX (1959), 205–229; O. Blau, *Bosnisch-türkische Sprachdenkmäler* (Leipzig, 1868); P. Skok, "Restes de la langue turque dans les Balkans," *Revue internationale des études balkaniques*, I (1935), 247–260 (585–598).

For the influence of Turkish on the languages of southeastern Europe, see F. Miklosich, *Die türkischen Elemente in den südost- und osteuropäischen Sprachen (Griechisch, Albanisch, Rumänisch, Bulgarisch, Serbisch, Kleinrussisch, Grossrussisch, Polnisch)*, Denkschriften der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philos.-Hist. Klasse (Vienna, 1884), XXXIV, 239–338; 1885, XXXV, 105–192; Nachtrag in 1889, XXXVII, 1–88, and in 1890, XXXVIII, 1–194; K. Sandfeld, *Linguistique balkanique. Problèmes et résultats* (Paris, 1930), 89–92, 159–162; I. Popović, *Geschichte der Serbo-kroatischen Sprache* (Wiesbaden, 1960), 582–584, 608–612; Kissling, "Zu den Turzismen in den südslavischen Sprachen," *Zeitschrift für Balkanologie*, II (1964), 77–87; A. Knežević, *Die Turzismen in den Sprache der Kroate und Serben* (Meisenheim am Glan, 1962); A. Škaljić, *Turcizmi u narodnom govoru i narodnoj književnosti Bosne i Hercegovina* (Sarajevo, 1957), I–II; H. F. Wendt, *Die türkischen Elemente im Rumänischen* (Berlin, 1960); A. Krajni, "Brief aperçu des emprunts à l'Albanais," *Studia Albanica*, II (1966), 85–96; S. Kakuk, "Les mots d'emprunts turcs-osmanlis dans le hongrois et les recherches d'histoire phonétique de la langue turque-osmanli," *ActaO*, V (1955), 181–194; Dawkins, *op. cit. (supra, note 87), passim*; A. Meidhoff, "Rückwanderer aus den islamitischen Sprachen im Neugriechischen," *Glotta*, 10 (1920); B. Tsonev, *Istorija na bulgarskii eziku*, I–III (Sofia, 1919–1937), II, 177–191.

The inseparable union of Church and State, and their determination of all formal aspects of society, resulted in a State structure and cultural life which were Muslim. The sultanate, bureaucracy, Church, literature, and much of art were Islamic. Byzantine formal society, on the other hand, was intimately connected with the *basileia* and Orthodoxy, and the large-scale adoption of Byzantine formal institutions could only follow the adoption of the Byzantine style of theocracy, as was the case in Bulgaria and Serbia; or it might occur when the neighboring society was still unformed and not affiliated with another developed Church-State apparatus. Whatever elements of this Byzantine formal culture appear in Ottoman society entered indirectly via the culture of Islamic civilization.

Nevertheless, this Turkish society, though Muslim in its formal expression, or Hochkultur, was strongly Byzantine in its folk culture, or Tiefkultur. This was the result of the fact that in the beginning the conquered subjects of the Turks were Christians of the Byzantine and semi-Byzantinized areas. The economic life of the Seljuks and Ottomans was greatly determined by these Christian peasants and city dwellers. Byzantine influence was particularly strong in agricultural and village life, but also in the cities with their craft and commercial traditions. In these latter, however, there was a significant admixture of Islamic urban elements. The economic continuity of Byzantium had important repercussions as well in the Turkish tax structure and administration. Finally, this widespread absorption and survival of Christian populations had a marked effect in the spheres of Turkish family life, popular beliefs, and practices. The period of Turkish flexibility vis-a-vis Byzantine institutions subsided and finally ended in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries. With the conquests complete, many Byzantine institutions ceased to exist. More importantly, Mehmed II and Sulayman I consolidated Ottoman institutional life in what came to be its classic form, and the conquests of Arab and Persian lands in the sixteenth century further strengthened the Islamic character of the empire.

What was the effect of the Turkish conquest and institutions on this Byzantine society and culture? The demands of Turkish political, fiscal, feudal, and religious institutions destroyed the economic as well as the political and social bases of Byzantine Hochkultur in the Balkans and Anatolia, and in so doing reduced this culture to an almost exclusively Volkskultur. Thus, in contrast to the Ottoman Turks who developed a rich formal literature, a classical music, and an impressive architecture, the formal literary production of their Christian subjects was penurious by comparison, and their secular music largely folk in character, as was much of their art. The survival of the greatly weakened Church and rise of the Phanariot class provided a diluted version of the old Byzantine Hochkultur on a limited scale, but more importantly the Church was a strong crutch upon which the Christian folk cultures partly depended. These folk cultures, however, now severed from the direction of a Christian theocratic State and prevented by stringent religious and social lines from participation in the formal cultural life of the Muslim Ottomans, developed a

vigorous life of their own in consonance with that part of the Byzantine cultural heritage which they had already absorbed and with their own purely folk traditions. This isolation of the Balkan folk cultures from the formal Byzantine and Ottoman cultures was compounded by the political isolation of Christians from the West. Though the isolation was never complete, it was nevertheless a reality which a comparison of the Turkish held Balkans with the Venetian-Hapsburg held lands nicely illumines. The Balkan and Anatolian Christian subjects of the Turks generally did not participate in the Renaissance, Reformation, and Counter-Reformation. On the other hand, Greeks and Slavs of the Aegean, Ionian, and Adriatic coasts, as well as Slavs of the northwest Balkans did participate in these dynamic periods of western culture and were greatly influenced by them. The literature, painting, and architecture of Crete, Corfu, Dalmatia, as well as of parts of the northwestern Balkans, reflect this influence. Whenever and wherever Christian political rule was replaced by that of the Ottomans in these regions, the social classes and artists usually fled, or, in any case, lost the economic affluence which had made it possible for them to function and produce.¹⁶⁶ The Ottomans thus reinforced the isolation of the Balkan peoples from the West at a time when contacts had been increasing because of western expansion and Byzantine decline.

Hence, the effect of Turkish forms on the Byzantine legacy was decapitation on the formal level and isolation on the folk level.

¹⁶⁶ J. Matl, *op. cit.* (*supra*, note 8), 85 ff., and *passim*; M. Chatzidakis, “Η κρητική ζωγραφική και η ιταλική χαλκογραφία,” *Κρητικά Χρονικά*, I (1947), 27–46; *idem*, *Icones de Saint-Georges des Grecs et de la collection de l'institut* (Venice, 1962); A. Embiricos, *L'école crétoise, dernière phase de la peinture byzantine* (Paris, 1967); *idem*, *La renaissance crétoise XVI^e et XVII^e siècles* (Paris, 1960).